



# Table of Contents

<b>Preface .....</b>	<b>2</b>
A. Report Organization .....	2
B. Acronyms .....	3
<b>I Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
A. Executive Summary .....	5
B. Purpose and Direction .....	26
C. Approach .....	28
D. Review Assumptions .....	30
E. Recommendations .....	30
F. Project Participation.....	31
G. Tier & ACS Project Team.....	37
<b>II. Study Findings: Law Enforcement.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>III. Study Findings: Prosecutors .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>IV. Study Findings: Courts .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>V. Study Findings: MDOC – Incarceration .....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>VI. Study Findings: MDOC - Probation and Parole.....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>VII. JIEM Information Exchange Points .....</b>	<b>106</b>



## Preface

### A. Report Organization

#### **Section I – Introduction**

**Executive Summary** – This section provides a summary of the details found in other sections of the report.

**Purpose and Direction** – This section identifies the legislation which created the Criminal Records and Justice Information Advisory Committee, their charge relating to electronic justice information sharing, and their efforts to meet that charge.

**Project Participation** – This section identifies how the criminal justice agencies participating in the study were selected, identifies each participating agency, and acknowledges each participant individually, by name and agency. This section also identifies the team who conducted the study, and how the team was formed.

**Approach** – This section details how the team approached the conducting of the study, including methods used and documents reviewed.

**Review of Assumptions** – This section identifies the assumptions under which the study was conducted.

**Recommendations** – This section identifies recommendations to be considered based on the review of the study findings.

**Sections II – VI** details the study findings from each criminal justice domain: Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Courts, Incarceration, Probation, and Parole

Each domain is summarized individually, and discusses in detail the following:

- Business drivers that impact the sharing of information
- Stakeholder Recommendations
- Technology Assessment
- Technical Environment
- Description of Technical Skills
- Capabilities of External Providers

**Section VII** – JIEM Information Exchange Points – Contains the summarized set of information exchange points discovered during the study.



## B. Acronyms

AFIS	Automated Fingerprint Identification System
ALERT	Automated Law Enforcement Response Team
ARS	Automated Reporting System
CAD	Computer Aided Dispatch
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHRS	Criminal History Record System
CJIS	Criminal Justice Information System
CR & JIAC	Criminal Records & Justice Information Advisory Committee
CRAC	Criminal Records Advisory Committee
CSR	Code of State Regulations
IS	Information System
IT	Information Technology
JIEM	Justice Information Exchange Model
JIS	Justice Information System
JMS	Jail Management System
KCPD	Kansas City Police Department
MCD	Mobile Computing Devices
MDOC	Department of Corrections
MDT	Mobile Data Terminals
MIBERS	Missouri Incident Based Reporting System
MJIT	Missouri Justice Integration Team
MOCIC	Mid States Crime Information Center
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSHP	Missouri State Highway Patrol
MULES	Missouri Uniform Law Enforcement System
NCIC	National Crime Information Center
NLETS	National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System
NSOR	National Sex Offender Repository
OCN	Offense Cycle Number

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



OOP	Orders of Protection
OSCA	Office of State Court Administrator
OIT	Office of Information Technology
P&P	Probation and Parole
PAQ	Project Assessment Quotation
PISR	Patrol Investigation System Reporting
REJIS	Regional Justice Information System
RMS	Records Management System
RSMo	Revised Statute of Missouri
SOMS	Sheriff's Office Management System
TAS/ADORS	Traffic Arrest System/Alcohol-Drug Offender Record System
UCR	Uniform Crime Reporting
VINES	Victim Information and Notification Everyday System



# I Introduction

## A. Executive Summary

Tier Technologies, Inc. (Tier) is pleased to provide the findings of the study on the state of justice information sharing among Missouri Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Courts, and Missouri Department of Corrections' (MDOC) Incarceration, and Probation & Parole (P&P).

In May of 2003, the Missouri Offices of Information Technology and State Courts Administrator, on behalf of the Missouri Justice Integration Team (MJIT), entered into a contractual agreement with Tier to conduct an assessment of the current state of justice information sharing, as it directly relates to public safety, among Missouri's criminal justice agencies and institutions. Tier entered into a subcontract agreement to complete the assessment with Affiliated Computer Services, Inc. (ACS). Tier's responsibilities were overall project management and completion of the assessment for Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, and MDOC's Incarceration. ACS's responsibilities were completion of the assessment for the Courts and MDOC's P&P.

The goal of this assessment was to take the next step in resolving Missouri's current problem, lack of real-time information system interfaces between Missouri criminal justice agencies, by identifying the business drivers for each criminal justice agency participating in the study, their existing technology and how these technologies help or hinder information sharing, and the information exchanged between those agencies. In addition to identifying the information that is exchanged, details about the exchanges were also gathered.

All study participants readily acknowledged the importance and value of sharing information. This acknowledgement and willingness to be proactive in providing access to justice data is a key enabler to successfully meeting Missouri's vision to:

*"Create and maintain an accessible, and appropriately secured, information system on individuals and events for criminal justice and non-criminal justice agencies that supports effective administration of the criminal justice system, public and officer safety, and public policy decisions in a cost-effective manner within the State of Missouri" (OIT's 2001-2003 Strategic Implementation Plan).*

There were significant differences in the degree of automation among the participants. Some participants had little or no automation while others were significantly automated. Those with a high degree of automation reported that using a computer system to store justice information, e-mail access, Internet access, access to external systems, access to Missouri Uniform Law Enforcement System (MULES), networks, and the Information Technology staff were key enablers to sharing justice information. Ninety-nine percent of the participants identified



technology improvements as a critical enabler to sharing justice information. The following improvements were identified:

1. Continued efforts to upgrade the various MSHP record access systems;
2. Expanded growth of mobile access to the various local area records management systems (RMS), incident reports, and MULES, using mobile data terminals or wireless laptops;
3. Continued deployment of automated records management systems by local Law Enforcement;
4. Shared networks among the criminal justice agencies;
5. Shared access to other criminal justice agencies' computer applications;
6. Continued expansion of computer applications to store criminal justice information;
7. Continued expansion of e-mail and Internet access;
8. Centralization of municipal arrest and incident data; and
9. Web access to public records.

Non-technical enablers included positive working relationships among the criminal justice agencies and close geographic proximity of Prosecutors and Courts.

Whenever a criminal justice agency lacked the technology listed above it was typically identified as an inhibitor. Specifically, the following technology related inhibitors were identified:

1. Not all Prosecutors have access to automated Prosecutor case information systems;
2. Non-integrated applications cause multiple entry of the same data;
3. Lack of access to Court case application systems, particularly the Justice Information System (JIS);
4. Courts employ different software packages to store justice information;
5. Courts store their data in different databases or file systems and have different hardware platforms;
6. None of the Courts are set up for electronic filing;
7. Many criminal justice agencies do not possess the technical capabilities to engage in electronic information sharing;
8. Limited access to the Internet;
9. Limited e-mail communications outside of their own agency;
10. Inability to easily access the data contained in Law Enforcement record management systems;
11. Inability of the current MSHP technical environment to support direct electronic submission of the various records formatted and generated by vendors for local Law Enforcement;

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



12. The current system for entering and sharing warrant information does not support the timely entry of new warrants, does not remove inactive warrants, forces the re-entry of warrants into MULES after they are issued by the Courts, and does not provide the ability to track warrants from a Criminal Justice Information System point of view;

Non-technical inhibitors included the following:

1. Lack of municipal arrest and incident data being centralized, either in Criminal History Repository System (CHRS), or in a separate repository specifically for municipal data.
2. Even though the majority of participants acknowledged the importance of sharing information, the protective “it’s my data” barrier must still be overcome.
3. There is a perception that some criminal justice agencies are unwilling to comply with statutory requirements allowing access to their data;
4. The current focus on Morpho-provided Livescan equipment options and the fees associated with acquiring this equipment without providing state sanctioned alternative option(s) that are less costly;
5. Deficient, guarded, and/or restrictive information sharing between Law Enforcement and P&P for incident investigation and for planning for a reintroduction to a community;
6. Homeland Security initiatives are adding an additional burden on Law Enforcement funding resources without increasing their ability to share justice information at the local level;
7. Lack of standards and commitment to the usage of National Crime Information Center (NCIC) charge codes among all criminal justice agencies is preventing accurate disposition reporting;
8. Inadequate staffing levels;
9. Manual information sharing increases the amount of time it takes to locate and then share the information;
10. Lack of training in the use of application systems;
11. Lack of training in justice procedures. Justice personnel should understand and follow proper procedures;
12. Some information is not being received at all;
13. A significant amount of information that is received is not timely, complete and/or accurate;
14. Business processes are not consistent; and
15. Business processes are not consistently followed.

Integrated application systems, timeliness, completeness, and accuracy of information topped the list of critical success factors. The majority of participants agreed that integrating the current application systems would reduce the amount of time it currently takes to exchange information with other criminal justice agencies. Completeness and accuracy would improve as well.



Additionally, staff workloads would be greatly reduced, allowing them to reduce backlogs and to focus on other important responsibilities.

Although integrated application systems topped the list, it was closely followed by the need to review, revise and enforce business procedures. While there are many areas where standardized business policies and procedures need to be defined, there are areas where they exist but training is needed. Many examples were given of situations where adequate information was not received because the sending agency did not realize it was part of their responsibility to do so. Therefore, training was identified as a critical success factor as well.

Almost all participants identified appropriate funding as a critical success factor. The implementation of new technologies needed to enable information sharing, reduce workloads, improve timeliness of data exchanges, as well as improve accuracy and completeness of data, will require significant amounts of funding. Additionally, the funding is needed for establishing standard business procedures and training on existing and new business procedures.

All participants identified appropriate and hindering constraints to information sharing. These were statutory or regulatory constraints that either allowed or prohibited information exchanges among the criminal justice agencies and agency or organizational policies that permit or prohibit specific actions related to information sharing.

It was the opinion of the participants that the majority of constraints were appropriate. These are listed in Section II through VI. However, there were a number of constraints that hinder information sharing. They are:

1. Current policies governing the definitions of justice information and the information stored in the CHRS are too narrow. This results in the exclusion of municipal arrest and incident data in the CHRS;
2. Current policies exist that enable civilian agencies to have access to data for investigative purposes, but restricts local Law Enforcement.
3. Judges have latitude in determining whether or not to give Prosecutors access to Court information systems. Refusal to grant access by judges in certain jurisdictions inhibits the sharing of information.
4. Amend the statute to allow sentence and judgment information to be sent from the Courts to MDOC electronically. The Circuit Court would like the ability to send electronic dispositions on additional sentences to MDOC. Currently, if an inmate from MDOC is sentenced on pending charges, upon final disposition, the sentence and judgment information is sent by certified mail, per state statute.
5. Modify Municipal Courts retention of records policy (Supreme Court Rules for Municipal Court 37.68) to be consistent with the rules applied to Circuit Court. The County Prosecutor enhances the misdemeanor Driving While Suspended charge to a felony, using prior





convictions. The state only requires the Municipal Courts to retain a copy of the disposition for these cases for three years. They can be destroyed after this time.

6. MDOC needs to develop strict procedures and require standardized forms with regard to filings of Uniform Disposition Detainers. MDOC currently allows Uniform Disposition Detainers to be filed by any inmate, and does not restrict filing procedures. §217.450 RSMo only requires the request to be in writing, but does not specify procedures or a document for filing such request.

A technology assessment was completed for each of the participating criminal justice agencies. Details on their technical and non-technical business practices, outside providers and their capability to respond to needs and requirements, existing justice information systems, mode of information exchanges (e.g. manual, automated), interagency agreements regarding integration and information exchange, and their agency's technical skills are found in Sections II through VI. An overall assessment for each discipline is provided below:

#### Law Enforcement

The technology available to Law Enforcement agencies participating in this study varies widely, but at minimum, all have a records management system and those administering a jail also have an automated jail management system.

- 7 of 7 Law Enforcement agencies have automated records management systems;
- Only 2 of 7 currently have deployed mobile data terminals (or laptops);
- 4 of 4 jails have at least a basic automated jail management system;
- Only 1 of 4 sheriffs departments is served by the county IS/IT staffs;
- None of the Law Enforcement agencies have interfaces to the Prosecutors, Courts, MDOC, or P&P for electronic exchanges of files, or that could support file exchanges;
- Other than MULES, most information requests to other criminal justice agencies are answered by fax (if it is small enough to fax), letter if it is too big to fax, or through an in person pick-up (if it is too big and too costly to mail);
- Each agency only has 1-2 IT/IS staff assigned;
- The depth of IT/IS staff training and certification ranges from self-taught to formal certifications;
- There is little automated access to other Law Enforcement agencies other than through MULES, with the exception of those agencies that are contributors to Automated Law Enforcement Response Team (ALERT) or Regional Justice Information System (REJIS).

Although each agency retains vendors to support their records management applications and jail management applications where applicable, they use the resource sparingly. The primary role of



the identified vendors is to deliver new releases as contracted and to provide training on the applications.

The application vendors of record do not play a significant role in the annual or long range planning of the departments.

Vendors of record for network support or hardware and maintenance support are also used sparingly. In most agencies, services are procured strictly on an as-needed basis.

Although the Law Enforcement study participants are very supportive of any effort to support new and/or expanded justice information sharing, they have little or no resources to expend on new initiatives.

There is room for significant improvement in the use of technology in the Law Enforcement community. The most pressing need is for Law Enforcement to obtain real-time information.

#### Prosecutors

The technology available to the Prosecutor study participants varies widely, from an office with a single PC with word processing capability and no Internet access to offices with networked PCs that have access to multiple application systems.

All of the Prosecutors have office productivity software such as word processors and spreadsheets. Most have Internet access and e-mail capability. Approximately half of the participating Prosecutors' Offices have automated Prosecutor Case Management systems. However, no two participating offices use the same Prosecutor Case Management system.

None of the Prosecutor Case Management systems are integrated with Court Case Management systems. Many (5 of 7) of the Prosecutors' Offices have inquiry access to Court Case Management systems for their Courts. This is useful for viewing case related information, but the lack of integrated systems results in duplicate entry of information and information exchanges that are paper, fax, and phone call based.

There is little automated access available to Law Enforcement, Corrections, Jails, and P&P application systems. Information gathered from these sources most often requires manual exchanges and re-entry of the same information.

In addition to the extra workload associated with the manual exchange of information with external justice agencies, significant effort is expended in preparing documents for the Courts. Due to the Courts often being overloaded with paperwork, most Prosecutors have adopted the business practice of preparing a number of forms for the Courts. An example is the application process for obtaining search warrants. The Prosecutors submit applications to the Courts and, if approved, the Courts issue the search warrants. However, most Prosecutors complete both the application and the warrant itself, the judge then simply signs the warrants if they are issued.

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



Very few technical services and software applications are supplied by outside providers. Some offices have access to REJIS, ALERT, and MULES. Several have subscription services with Westlaw to obtain case law information. One office purchased a system for tracking bad checks from a small local firm and one office uses the Prosecutor Dialog System from Graphic Computer Solutions.

The Prosecutors generally do not have technical staff to implement and support application systems. Some of the offices have access to the Court's technical staff or city government staff for technical support.

In summary, approximately one-half of the Prosecutor study participants have an automated system for managing Prosecutor cases. None of these systems are fully integrated with the Courts. There is no standard Prosecutor Case Management system in use, although the Prosecutor Dialog System is coming into wider use and has been identified by the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services as the system that should be used. The manual exchange of information increases the workload in the Prosecutors' Offices, especially for those offices that do not have inquiry access into Court case management systems.

There is room for significant improvement in the use of technology in the Prosecutors' Offices. The most pressing need is for Prosecutor Case Management systems to be integrated with Court Case Management systems. Receiving Law Enforcement information electronically rather than via paper forms would reduce the workload associated with re-entering information into the Prosecutor systems.

### Courts

All Courts participating in the study utilize computer systems to store justice information. Two of the six Courts are upgrading their systems to newer technology or software that will help implement new data exchanges. All of the Courts have e-mail and Internet access, access to external systems (e.g. ALERT, MULES, REJIS, etc.), and five of the six utilize a network. Four of the six Courts have interfaces with other agencies and provide web access to public records.

Four of the six Courts employ IT staff. The IT staffs have technical skill sets that will facilitate the development and implementation of data exchanges.

Five of the six Courts utilize different software packages to store justice information. Their data is stored using different database management systems or file systems. The hardware platforms utilized varies as well. None of the Courts are set up for electronic filing. However, four of the six Courts noted electronic filing as a long-term objective.



### MDOC Incarceration, P&P

The technology available to the MDOC Incarceration & P&P study participants is consistent and capable -- the current OPII system is the agency's computer system that stores and manages criminal justice information. PAPIIS (Probation and Parole files) and OMIS (Department of Adult Institution) files and systems were merged to become OPII. MDOC also has access to MULES.

There is limited office productivity software, such as word processors and spreadsheets. There is limited Internet access and e-mail capability. The staff that is located in the MDOC institutions, such as institutional parole offices, does not have access to the Internet or e-mail, due to building age and design constraints, as well as, financial constraints.

None of the MDOC systems are integrated with Court Case Management systems, and none of the study participants have inquiry access to Court case management systems for court information. The lack of integrated systems results in duplicate entry of information and information exchanges that are currently paper, fax, and phone call based. It is important to note that many of the MDOC exchanges must include a certified, hard copy of documents.

There is virtually no electronic access to Law Enforcement, Prosecutor, Jails, Courts and application systems; MULES being the sole exception. All information gathered from these sources is manual. Additionally, MDOC is not set up for electronic filing.

In addition to the extra workload associated with the manual exchange of information with external justice agencies, significant effort is expended making phone calls and sending faxes to obtain required information.

With the exception of MULES, very limited technical services and software applications are supplied by outside providers.

MDOC does plan to implement web access for public information and records.

Recommendations were solicited from all study participants for any areas they desired to be changed, or constraints they believe must be maintained. In order not to lose the intent of each recommendation or to minimize its importance, no summarization was done. Additionally, recommendations are not attributed to the individual participant making the suggestion. Rather, they are presented as a consolidated listing of recommendations made by the participants during the information gathering process. No attempt has been made to prioritize the recommendations. No research was conducted to determine whether or not the recommendation has merit, or if the participant making the recommendation was misinformed or unaware of contradictory information. All recommendations by the participants are listed below by discipline:



### Law Enforcement

1. Encourage further development of regional and/or statewide repositories for municipal arrest and incident information, including the possible use of data warehousing as a way to enhance justice information sharing between Law Enforcement agencies. Special emphasis should be placed on the timely data entry to any such repository.
2. Efforts should be made to incorporate the new internet technologies and search capabilities that are now available in the commercial world for application to justice information sharing; especially the concept of a “Google™” type search of records management systems for the desired justice information.
3. Review the entire warrant management process to ensure that the sharing of warrant information is based on the following business process assumptions:
  - a. Redundant entry by local Law Enforcement and the Courts can be eliminated.
  - b. New entries will be timely so that queries will return accurate results.
  - c. Inactive warrants will be deleted on a timely basis.
  - d. All justice agencies should be able to ascertain electronically when a warrant has been acted on.
4. Allow Law Enforcement agencies greater access to MDOC’s information, including but not limited to, a direct electronic interface. MDOC has a wealth of information not being fully tapped – especially conditional release information and/or information about disciplinary actions for an individual. If this information could be made available, it would greatly enhance investigations and justice information sharing.
5. The current business process for Offense Cycle Number (OCN) assignment needs to be improved to ensure that only one identifying number is associated with one person and one event.

This level of tracking continuity has not been attained due to duplication and conflicts of multiple OCNs for the same person and same event.
6. The current business practices for disposition reporting by the Prosecutors and the Courts needs to be reviewed. Current disposition reporting requirements, as required by state statutes, are not being followed. Procedures need to be identified, including sanctions for non-compliance, or the establishment of new requirements if necessary, to ensure the timely, accurate, and complete reporting of disposition information.
7. The current business rules governing access to P&P information by Law Enforcement, and existing practices need to be reviewed to ensure and/or establish the following:
  - a. Information regarding the dangerousness of a subject when a pick-up order is issued;
  - b. Access to Pre-Sentence Investigation reports;
  - c. Access to P&P Violation reports;



- d. Notification when a P&P Warrant is issued, as this becomes a housing issue for local jails.
  - e. Availability of P&P staff to confirm warrants during non-business hours. If a warrant can't be confirmed, the subject must be released.
  - f. Prohibit P&P officers from accepting "word of mouth warrants" from other jurisdictions. Documentation needs to be received, as the Sheriff's Department can't hold a subject with a verbal approval.
8. Efforts to automate the Courts should be continued, with an added focus on sharing justice information that directly impacts Law Enforcement (i.e. electronic access to Court schedules, automatic notification of court date changes, timely notification of warrant creation, electronic copies of warrants and electronic disposition reporting).
  9. Provide any Law Enforcement agency that has an ORI a more direct and expedited access to all external databases. Agencies must go through MSHP to get to federal databases, and often wait several days to get responses.
  10. Flexibility similar to the code 80 used by MSHP officers should be extended to local Law Enforcement, so they do not have to provide a reason for inquiring on a subject.
  11. The state should help fund the development and implementation of true integrated county system to enhance justice information sharing. Under such a system, there would be a unified approach to calling up and reading reports, editing incident information, having an ability to see what investigations are under way in any agency within the county. All officers should have mobile data terminals (MDTs) and/or mobile laptop capabilities.
  12. Establish a statewide gun permit database to enhance and/or improve incident investigations.
  13. Develop state standards for management of county jails, the records associated with managing inmates, and the exchanges of those documents.
  14. The existing business practices for registering out-of-state sex offenders need to be reviewed. There is a loophole in the current law that allows sex offenders moving to Missouri from other states not to be fingerprinted.
  15. Encourage the Courts to use the full charge codes as published, with NCIC identifier codes included. Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA) does not currently use the NCIC identifiers that are listed in published charge codes.
  16. Review the business practices associated with agencies updating their systems in order to have the most current charge codes and establish a best practice for ensuring that all agencies have access to, and are using the most current charge codes. Agencies are not retiring old charge codes, and continue using them when they are not valid.
  17. Find a way to protect Law Enforcement so that investigations will not be jeopardized when P&P receives MULES hits when a Law Enforcement agency makes an inquiry on a probationer or parolee.



18. The 20-hour hold rule does not work well for Law Enforcement agencies, especially when you factor in weekends, holidays and end of day activity. It is recommended that it be replaced by a 48-hour hold rule.

### Prosecutors

1. Allow Prosecutors access to the Justice Information System (JIS).

Prosecutors need access to Associate and Circuit Court case information that is contained in JIS. There is often not enough staff for the large Prosecutor caseloads. There is too much paperwork; it gets backed-up and put in a box. A large effort is required to obtain Court information that could be retrieved electronically if the Prosecutors had access to JIS.

2. Case information should be abstracted from JIS with a format and content similar to the information received from the Westlaw subscription service in order to support case research on Circuit Court cases.

The Westlaw subscription service only provides case information at the Appellate and Supreme Court levels.

3. Integrate Prosecutor case management systems with JIS.

Prosecutors often have read-only access to Court information. However, there is virtually no automated exchange of information between the Prosecutors and the Courts. The manual exchange of information via paper, phone, and fax is time consuming and inefficient. The same case-related information is often entered multiple times in different, non-integrated systems.

4. Use a common identifier for an incident that accompanies all subsequent documentation.

Incident documentation is often submitted to Prosecutors prior to the arrest of a defendant. When the arrest occurs, Prosecutors are seldom notified, making it difficult to tie documentation together.

5. Implement a central repository for municipal offenses.

6. Municipal Prosecutors and Courts should be included on the JIS.

7. Municipal case information should be included on Case.Net.

8. In order to prevent duplicate OCNs, fingerprinting of subjects should only occur at the booking agency.

In many cases, the arresting officer fingerprints the subject and then delivers the subject to jail, where subject is fingerprinted again. This can result in multiple OCNs for the same arrest.

9. Provide a more user-friendly interface for MULES, and provide training on how to interpret MULES responses.





10. Submit Law Enforcement information to Prosecutors electronically.

Information is presently received manually. Sometimes the Prosecutors' staff must drive to the Law Enforcement agency to pick up the documentation. Information is then keyed in from Law Enforcement documents. This results in duplicate entry and duplicate paper record storage. Not receiving records electronically means manual files can be at one of many different locations prior to entry.

11. Modify existing systems or implement a new system that provides for electronic exchange of information between county jails, MDOC facilities, and Prosecutors' offices.

This would eliminate the need for numerous phone calls to obtain the information.

12. Issue blocks of Court case numbers to the Prosecutors' offices.

Some Courts don't issue case numbers after 3 p.m. This wastes Prosecutor staff time and limits Law Enforcement access to the Prosecutor for the purpose of filing cases from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.

13. Allow secondary dissemination of information if the requesting agency has the authority to directly access the information.

The prohibition on secondary dissemination of information introduces extra effort into the information gathering process. Two agencies with authority to directly access information should be able to share that same information.

14. Increase dissemination of Violent and Sexual Predator Information by changing statutory limitations.

15. Criminal history information should be made more accurate and up to date by the enforcement of the statute on arrest and disposition reporting (§43.503 RSMo).

Complete and accurate arrest and disposition information is not being reported to the central repository in a timely fashion.

16. Provide funding so Prosecutors desiring access to Regional Justice Information System (REJIS) and Automated Law Enforcement Response Team (ALERT) can be provided with system access.

17. Municipal Prosecutors should receive training on statutory requirements regarding the submission of fingerprint cards to the CHRS.

Not all municipal Prosecutors have a clear understanding of which printable offenses are reportable.

18. Prosecutors should receive a copy of all completed search warrants. This statutory requirement is not always followed, and should be enforced.





19. Prosecutors request that the Courts provide them with copies of probation violation hearing notices and probation violation reports.

The Prosecutor is not always informed of probation violation hearings, which sometimes results in s/he not being present for the hearings. It is important that the Prosecutor has an opportunity to provide input at the hearings.

20. For county jails, a system/process should be developed to readily identify whether an individual detained on a 20-hour hold is being held on state or municipal charge(s). This will allow the appropriate Prosecutor to be notified.

In some cases, the municipal Prosecutor is called on all 20-hour holds. Researching the individual scenarios to determine if the individual is held on state or municipal charges is time consuming. If the municipal Prosecutor is notified with little of the 20 hours remaining, and the individual is being held on state charges, this may result in the individual being released before a warrant can be obtained.

21. Technology available to Prosecutors' should be upgraded to keep up with the technology used to gather evidence. Two examples were given:
- a. A victim of harassment recorded the suspect on an MP3 player and gave the tape to Law Enforcement, who copied it to a compact disk (CD). When attempting to play the CD for the Court, it was realized that the tape did not copy well.
  - b. Security cameras are no longer routinely recorded on VHS. Often, they are recording on disk or in a digital image format. Not all Prosecutors have the technology to review evidence recorded on these new media.

22. For a Trial De Novo, all disposition data from Circuit Courts should be entered in the municipal case system.

23. Provide an automated notification for Prosecutors when court dates change.

24. Prosecutors should receive automated notification when a defendant is given a court date after being arrested on a warrant.

Many times, the Prosecutors are not notified of warrant arrests. The arresting agency gives the defendant a court date and fails to notify the Prosecutor. The defendant then appears in Court, and the Prosecutor, not knowing the case was scheduled, is not prepared.

25. Prosecutors should receive electronic notification of warrant information, bond amounts, and copies of search warrants.

Large caseloads and small staffs make obtaining this information difficult.

26. Law Enforcement should always provide an OCN when submitting documentation for a charging decision.

This will save the Prosecutors time and confusion associated with attaching the OCN to the case later (and sometimes this never occurs, which impacts disposition reporting to the CHRS).



27. Formalize the process of Law Enforcement submitting cases to the Prosecutor, and the process by which the Prosecutor informs Law Enforcement of acceptance or refusal of cases.

Formalizing the process would make it more clear what information was submitted to the Prosecutor and would document the reasons for the Prosecutor actions taken (or not taken).

28. Prosecutors request that the Courts forward copies of all motions filed by defense attorneys to the Prosecutors.

Presently, some defense attorneys file motions directly with the Courts and often fail to provide copies to the Prosecutors. This lack of information inhibits the effective management of Prosecutor cases.

29. Law Enforcement should submit Fingerprint Card Disposition Sheets and files to the Prosecutors at the same time. This will help to ensure that the appropriate information is sent to the appropriate Prosecutor.

Files and fingerprint cards are often not submitted at the same time. This results in officers submitting stacks of Fingerprint Card Disposition Sheets for both municipal and state offenses, causing additional work for the Municipal Prosecutor.

### Courts

1. Provide Municipal Courts access to financial information for cases transferred to Circuit Court.

Municipal Courts would like to see financial information about cases transferred to Circuit Court. Financial data is currently stored on a system that is not available to other agencies.

2. Provide Municipal Court access to confidential records.

Currently, some Municipal Courts have access to St. Louis County Court data through REJIS. However, §610 RSMo restricts the agencies that are allowed to view confidential records.

3. Municipal Courts would like to interface with Law Enforcement so that tickets would be filed electronically.

Currently, paper copies of the tickets are filed.

4. Provide MULES terminals within the Municipal Courts. If no individuals at the Courts are certified to use MULES, then certification must occur. Additional funding may also be necessary.

Information about an individual's criminal history is not received/not accessible from other Courts; such information includes arrest data, state charges and convictions.



5. Modify Municipal Courts retention of records policy (Supreme Court Rules for Municipal Courts 37.68) to be consistent with the rules applied to Circuit Courts.

County Prosecutors enhance a misdemeanor Driving While Suspended charge to a felony using prior convictions. The state only requires Municipal Courts to retain a copy of the disposition for these cases for three years, and can be destroyed after that time.

6. Provide Municipal Courts with disposition information on cases that were sent to Circuit Court.

When cases are transferred to the Circuit Courts as a result of a request for Jury Trial or a Municipal cases being appealed, the Circuit Courts do not send the final dispositions of the case back to Municipal Courts.

7. Circuit Courts would like to send Electronic Monitoring Lists electronically to local Law Enforcement.

If they do not have this information, some individuals may be released from the electronic monitoring device.

8. Electronically provide Circuit Courts with Jury Trial Requests and Municipal Appeals.

Currently these cases are transferred to the Circuit Courts manually. Creating an electronic exchange of this information would greatly reduce the amount of time spent by the Courts' staff in entering the case information into their case management systems.

9. Provide the ability for Circuit Courts to communicate Sentence & Judgment information to the Jails and MDOC in a timely manner.

Courts would like to share this information electronically, to make it timely.

10. Provide the ability for Circuit Courts to communicate to Law Enforcement in a timelier manner when warrants are issued, lists of outstanding warrants, and when warrants are recalled.

Courts would like to share this information electronically, to make it timely.

11. Circuit Courts would like to provide Sheriffs with information when Summonses are issued and served.

Courts would like to share this information electronically, to make it timely. This is hindered by statutory restrictions for actual/electronic signatures.

12. Provide electronic information when bonds are posted and the amount of the bond.

The date on which a defendant posts bond, and the amount of bond posted, is not received in a timely manner.

13. Develop a procedure for submitting jail time completion information to the Courts on a regular basis.

This is a timeliness issue for the Courts and often the Courts must contact the jails for this Information.



14. Courts would like to receive program completion/failure information from MDOC electronically.

15. Courts would like to electronically transfer Court notes and/or docket sheets to MDOC.

When an incarcerated defendant is brought to Court for a hearing etc., MDOC requires Court notes or a copy of the docket sheet reflecting the Court action when the defendant is returned to MDOC. This exchange would be done much more efficiently if it occurred electronically.

16. Need to develop an electronic court date notification system for Law Enforcement and Prosecutors.

The dates for scheduled Court events are not being received in a timely manner or are not received at all by Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Jails, and other Courts. This is mainly requested for traffic cases, but could also be beneficial in criminal cases. Court calendars are not currently sent electronically to Law Enforcement or Prosecutors. Hearing calendars are available in JIS; however, Law Enforcement and Prosecutors' systems are not compatible with JIS, and no interface has been developed.

17. Provide Courts with Parole and Flat Time release dates.

It would be helpful to the sentencing Courts to receive Parole release dates or Flat Time release dates. The release date information would also be useful with regard to juvenile offenders serving time in the Department of Youth Services.

18. Courts would like to receive daily jail population lists electronically.

Information about who is currently in custody/jail is not being received in a timely manner. Electronically transferred lists would allow Courts to monitor those in custody and length of time in custody. Additionally, it would be helpful to know when offenders are in custody for Probation Warrants.

19. The Courts want a central repository of Municipal Court dispositions to be maintained and available to the Courts and Law Enforcement. This repository could be similar to the CHRS.

The Courts would like the ability to obtain dispositions of Municipal Court cases throughout the State of Missouri. Disposition information from other counties and other Courts is not being received in a timely manner.

20. Develop an interface between Courts and local Law Enforcement agencies to provide electronic information regarding case dispositions.

21. Allow Courts to enter warrant information into MULES without the data going into the unverified state.

Currently, the Courts send a hard copy of their warrants to county Sheriffs' Departments where the warrant information is then entered into the MULES System. Law Enforcement officers need this warrant information immediately as they may have contact with an individual and not be aware that a warrant is active, if it is not in MULES. This risk increases in some of the larger jurisdictions where a backlog may occur due to the volume of warrants issued.



22. Amend the statute to allow sentence and judgment information to be sent electronically from the Courts to the MDOC.

The Circuit Courts would like the ability to electronically send dispositions on additional sentences to MDOC. Currently, if an inmate in MDOC is sentenced on pending charges, upon final disposition, the sentence and judgment information is sent by certified mail, per state statute.

23. Set procedures for who should create the OCN.

There is no statewide policy specifying which agency/jurisdiction is responsible for creating the OCN when out-of-county warrants are served.

24. Simplify the OCN form by reducing the amount of required information and reducing the amount of carbon copies. Providing electronic means to capture fingerprints may also assist with this issue.

Courts are not consistently receiving the OCNs from the Prosecutors, in part because the OCNs are not being passed from Law Enforcement to the Prosecutors. Law Enforcement must manually type these forms due to the number of carbon copies that need to be made. Also, the amount of required information contributes to the incompleteness of the forms. Providing electronic means to capture fingerprints may assist with this issue; however, these fingerprint systems cost approximately \$50,000 and few agencies have these resources available.

25. Develop the ability to electronically submit Probation Warrants to both local Law Enforcement and the Courts.

Information when a Probation Warrant is issued and when individuals are picked up on Probation warrants is not being received at all or is not received in a timely manner.

26. Create a rule or statute detailing procedures for distribution of Probation Warrants.

The Circuit Courts would like to consistently receive copies of warrants issued by the State Probation Office.

27. Create a website where information about outstanding/pending warrants could be made available to the Courts.

Information on outstanding/pending warrants from other counties/Courts within the state as well as information about when a warrant has been served is not received at all, is inaccessible, or is not received in a timely manner.

28. Review the policies and procedures for clearing warrants.

Jake's Law requires an NCIC and MULES check for outstanding warrants before releasing a defendant. If warrants for jurisdictions having holds on the defendants were not cleared, the execution of Jake's Law would prevent release of that individual.

When an individual has outstanding warrants in multiple jurisdictions and that individual is arrested, Law Enforcement agencies record that the individual was arrested, and all outstanding warrants that exist in MULES and NCIC are cleared. The fact that other

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



warrants exist for the individual is not communicated to the arresting county or to other counties. Before an individual is released from custody, Law Enforcement is required to check for outstanding warrants. Because all of the outstanding warrants that existed for the individual were cleared when the individual was arrested, no outstanding warrants will appear, and the individual will be released

29. Prosecutors need recommendations on bond investigations in a timelier manner from the Courts.

30. Provide Prosecutors electronic access to disposition information.

Prosecutors would like access to all case dispositions, some of which may not be viewable to the public, and therefore not accessible via CaseNet.

31. Automatically generate lists from the Prosecutors and Courts to be used as checks and balances to monitor expiring cases.
32. MDOC needs to develop strict procedures and require standardized forms with regard to filings of Uniform Disposition Detainers.

MDOC currently allows Uniform Disposition Detainers to be filed by any inmate, and does not restrict filing procedures. §217.450 RSMo only requires the request to be in writing, but does not specify procedures or a document for filing such request.

33. Work with MDOC to develop a consistent practice or written procedure detailing the necessary requirements for completing the sentence and judgment form.

There are times when MDOC refuses to accept a defendant into the institution because the sentence and judgment form has not been completed properly in the opinion of the MDOC. As a result, the individual is returned to the county jail until the necessary changes are made to the sentence and judgment document. It appears as though the courts are not completely in tune with the MDOC procedures and requirements of the defendant's reception. This may be a training issue.

34. MDOC should provide a list of available program options and openings to the Courts prior to case dispositions.

Information about the availability of diversion programs or programs within a detention facility is not being received in a timely manner.

35. Provide MSHP access to REJIS so they can view case disposition information.

When Courts sends dispositions to MSHP and there is no matching case filing, the disposition is rejected. Later, when Prosecutors submit the filing to MSHP, it is lacking a disposition. MSHP then requests the disposition from the Courts. The Courts then re-submit the disposition to the MSHP.



### MDOC Incarceration

1. Circuit Courts should provide information that is currently not being sent or is not supplied in a timely basis, or with the desired level of completeness on Sentencing Orders. Specifically,
  - a. If the cause number has changed for any reason, the prior referenced numbers should be noted and included;
  - b. The cause of the document must be the cause under which the offender was sentenced;
  - c. Require that the Judge's name be typed under the signature line on any order that is signed by the Judge;
  - d. In instances where the cause is ordered to be served concurrent or consecutive with a federal, or out-of-state jurisdiction, to attach the pertinent information;
  - e. Offense descriptions must match the offense code descriptions.
2. Every county should have access to, and use, Case.Net for Court Dockets/Court Minutes information.
3. The Writ Ad Testificandum should denote whether the writ is based on §491.230 RSMo and, if so, the Section cited.
4. The Writ Ad Prosequendum should contain the offense date and the offense description.
5. Jail Time Endorsements from county Sheriffs should include all dates when the individual was held in the Sheriff's custody – or held for the Sheriff by another agency. They should include the case number under which the individual was being held. This information should be sent to the MDOC and not to the offender. It would be very helpful for MDOC to know the reasons for release, if the offender is released from custody. The information should always include the class of offense, regardless of whether it's a felony, misdemeanor, or infraction.
6. Prosecutors should send documents and information at the time of commitment and it should be complete and accurate. They should also include a description of the offense, as well as the victim's age and gender.
7. Add class of offense information to warrants.
8. Implement an electronic warrant system.
9. Add the offense date and offense information to all writs.
10. Submit complete disposition information for all misdemeanor and infractions cases from Municipal Courts. All systems and agencies must use the same standardized forms.
11. Implement an electronic link between the Circuit Courts and the MDOC Records Officer.
12. Create or improve MDOC's web site to include commonly requested, and appropriate to release, information. It takes considerable time and effort to locate manually requested information, as the process is manual.





## MDOC P&P

1. Provide the ability to access case information from the Court's online public information system, Case.Net.

Some P&P offices experience difficulty obtaining the required hard copy of defendants' case information from Prosecutors and Courts. P&P protocol requires the file to be opened within two (2) days. Often this is delayed anywhere from seven (7) days to a month, as the necessary information is not received in a timely manner.

2. Courts need to provide the ability to view Court Cost information from Case.Net

This information is currently received manually in a majority of the jurisdictions. This information is received in the form of reports from the Courts, phone calls, or P&P Officers going to the courthouse to obtain this information.

3. Provide access to MSHP hold files.

More complete arrest information is required by MDOC to assist in knowledgeable decisions regarding offender management.

4. Review the business rules of the CHRS.

Criminal history information that is sent from MDOC to the CHRS is placed into a hold file until all the information acquired earlier in the life cycle of the cases are received by MSHP. Life cycles consist of information from Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, and the Courts.

5. Automate communications through email.

MDOC has limited ability to communicate with Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, and Courts via email.

6. Allow Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Jails, and Courts to inquire on information maintained in MDOC's OPII system, including special conditions of Probation and Parole.

This would increase the timeliness and efficiency of providing offender information to Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Jails, and Courts.

7. Automate the Sex Offender Registration Notification and electronic communication of registration.

This would increase timeliness of Sex Offender Registration Notification from the Sheriffs' Departments to MDOC.

8. Provide clarification for § 217.362 RSMo.

MDOC is not receiving amended Sentence and Judgment forms from the Courts for offenders deemed ineligible for community sentencing programs.





9. Expedite the delivery of Offense Reports to MDOC institutions by obtaining an agreement with Law Enforcement to submit offense reports within 3 days of a request.

Obtaining official offense reports from Law Enforcement can take approximately 30 days. More timely receipt of this information would increase the efficiency of completing intake assessments and completion of violation reports for unauthorized returns.

10. Obtain an agreement with county Sheriffs to hold parolees in the local jails a minimum of 5 days before returning them to MDOC.

This would reduce the number of unauthorized returns to MDOC.

11. Educate Law Enforcement on what occurs upon placing a “locate” on a warrant.

There are inconsistencies in the way warrants are cleared in MULES. If Law Enforcement puts a locate on a warrant, the warrant is automatically cleared from the system within 72 hours, even if the offender is not taken into custody.

This study is a high-level assessment of the state of justice information sharing in the State of Missouri. As such, the study is a good “next step” in determining how to improve the exchange of justice information both at the local and the state level.

The criminal justice agency study participants are representative of the criminal justice agencies statewide, but as there are other agencies, the information gathered and reported may not be inclusive of all of the issues facing all of the criminal justice agencies in Missouri. Additionally, other agencies, external to the criminal justice agencies (such as Department of Social Services and Department of Mental Health), were not included in the scope of this study per the contractual agreement with Tier. In order to develop a truly integrated justice environment for the state, these other agencies may need to be examined from the perspective of their interaction with Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Courts, Department of Correction’s Incarceration P&P.

An examination of the business drivers reveals there is a definite demand and need for justice information sharing. Resolution of even a single issue would greatly enhance and streamline the administration of justice in the State of Missouri.

Although there is a substantial number of computer systems in place, and IT staff to support and engage in external information sharing, the study reveals that the technology infrastructure is not yet ready to support justice information sharing. There is still a need to resolve numerous technology and procedural issues. For example, disparate systems (e.g., hardware, software, databases, etc.) will complicate integration efforts. System standardization, however, is only part of the solution. Technology solutions are driven by the need to further examine procedural and business practices surrounding the business drivers identified in this study.

The data presented in this report (existing information exchanges, critical business drivers and the state of technology) provides the State of Missouri with information necessary to proceed to the next step of improving the exchange of information among state and local justice agencies. Specific goals and objectives (i.e., resolution of individual business drivers and/or technology

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



issues) can now be established for either an expanded assessment study to address agencies not covered under the PAQ, and/or development of cross-agency data sharing standards and procedures for the information exchanges identified in this study.

Standardization on a relatively small number of computer application systems deployed on a standard hardware, operating system, and database architecture within the Law Enforcement, Jail, Prosecutor, and Court disciplines would reduce the overall cost of implementing an integrated criminal justice system from a statewide perspective. MDOC is not included in this list because of their OPII system. The increasing demands for enhanced levels of data exchange and system integration will put additional strains on existing systems and processes, and will require substantial investments to satisfy these demands. Additionally, there are many criminal justice agencies that do not have computer application systems but will need them to reach the ultimate goal of a statewide criminal justice system. It will be important for them to procure a standardized technical solution.

There may be substantial benefits gained by coordinating and standardizing on a solution or relatively few solutions for each of the disciplines. It is believed that economy of scale could be realized if this was done. If the agencies perform the automation projects independently, the total cost of doing so will be enormous. This cost can be reduced dramatically through the coordination and leveraging of efforts, and standardization of work-products.

Additionally, to reduce the cost of the total effort, it is important to build upon projects that have already been developed, are in progress, or currently planned. An example would be the repository for the municipal arrest and incident information. Should the CHRS be enhanced to include this data or should a separate repository be built? There are valid arguments on both sides of this question. In order to answer this question and many others like it, objective cost/benefit analysis must be completed.

In summary, this study identified a number of key business drivers (technical and non-technical) that do or will enable the successful sharing of criminal justice information. It also identified inhibitors to this success. Critical success factors were identified and a technology assessment completed. The participating criminal justice agencies provided an incredible list of recommendations they identified as necessary to resolve issues they face in their day-to-day responsibilities. These recommendations, along with the information exchanges that were identified and documented, provide the framework for completing the next steps necessary to fulfill the vision for the criminal justice system.

## B. Purpose and Direction

With the passage of House Bill 1895 in 2002, the Criminal Records Advisory Committee became the Criminal Records and Justice Information Advisory Committee. The language of this legislation charged the committee with the following tasks:



1. To recommend general policies with respect to the philosophy, concept and operational principles of the Missouri criminal history record information system established by §43.500 to §43.530 RSMo, in regards to the collection, processing, storage, dissemination and use of criminal history record information maintained by the central repository.
2. To assess the current state of electronic justice information; and
3. Recommend policies and strategies, including standards and technology, for promoting electronic justice information sharing, and coordinating among the necessary criminal justice agencies and institutions; and
4. Provide guidance regarding the use of any state or federal funds appropriated for promoting electronic information sharing.

The CR&JIAC created a working subcommittee, the Missouri Justice Integration Team, to aid in fulfilling these duties. The MJIT developed a strategic plan for the integration of Missouri justice information, and with the strategic plan in place, their efforts focused on a statewide criminal justice information sharing study.

Various criminal justice agencies currently have public safety data that is of interest to other criminal justice agencies. Today information is shared between criminal justice agencies via primarily manual processes. As a result of this mode of sharing, information must be re-keyed into the various agency information systems as it moves from one agency to the next. This re-keying inevitably introduces human error, mainly in the form of transcription mistakes, although interpretive errors are also a problem. These errors, which accumulate as data is manually reentered from system to system, corrupt vital information to the point where final case dispositions cannot be posted to the Missouri Criminal History Repository. Without accurate key index numbers, dispositions cannot be matched with their underlying arrest events.

Understanding the problem helped the assessment focus on the information that must be gathered from the Missouri criminal justice agencies participating in the study. To resolve the problem it was important to gather details about the following:

1. Privacy concerns, time requirements, and statutory restrictions related to the sharing of information;
2. Agency or organizational policies that permit or prohibit specific actions related to information sharing;
3. Recommendations from stakeholders to resolve the information sharing problem;
4. Existing technologies and how these technologies help or hinder information sharing; and
5. Information exchanged between criminal justice agencies.

The details for items 1 through 4 are documented in Sections II through VI of this report. These sections contain both summarized and detailed information in order to present an accurate picture of the study participants' current environments.



The details gathered for the information exchanged between criminal justice agencies is documented in Section VII - JIEM Information Exchange Points. The following is documented for each information exchange:

1. Sending agency;
2. Receiving agency;
3. The event that triggers the sending of information;
4. The processes being executed by the sending and receiving criminal justice agencies;
5. The conditions that cause the information to be exchanged;
6. The documents that are sent; and
7. The how the documents are exchanged (mode of exchange), manual or automated.

### C. Approach

The project began with development of a project plan that detailed the project scope, definition of the requirements and the effort necessary to satisfy all Information Sharing Study requirements. This plan was delivered to the Office of State Courts Administrator and Office of Information Technology for approval. After approval, the team was assembled and oriented, the methodology finalized, and preparations for conducting the information gathering sessions completed.

The methodology that Tier used as a basis for completing the identification of information sharing business needs and requirements tasks of the project was the SEARCH (The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics), Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM). This methodology was used to capture the information sharing needs and requirements.

A letter was developed and sent to all study participants prior to their information gathering session. For the Law Enforcement, Prosecuting Attorney, and the Department of Correction's Incarceration, Probation and Parole participants the letter explained the purpose of the study, information that was needed about each criminal justice information exchange, questions for the participants to answer, what participants needed to do to prepare for the session, and an attachment containing examples of each dimension (detail) of an information exchange. The letter for the Courts was presented in the form of two questionnaires, one for information exchanges and the other for the technical environment.

In preparation for the information gathering sessions, the team reviewed documents provided to them. Following is a list of the documents that were provided and reviewed:

1. Byrne Grant Survey - Survey conducted by the Missouri Police Chiefs' Association to gather information about each police department's workload, staff, budget, jail information, record management system, and the technical architecture used for the system



2. Byrne Grant Survey Results – Access database containing the results of the Byrne Grant survey.
3. Prosecuting Attorney Report – Completed by the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services to report which county Prosecutors were on a network, had software packages, had access to MULES, MACSS and JIS, and where they are located (in a courthouse or private office).
4. Sheriff/Prosecutors Report – Completed by the Missouri Sheriff’s Association to report which sheriff offices were on a network, had a record management system, had a jail software package, had access to MULES and the Internet, and where they are located (in a courthouse or not).
5. EC/2004 Information Architecture Report, Appendix P - Missouri Courts External Information Needs – This review allowed the team to pre-populate a list of the courts’ information exchanges. This list was confirmed during and after the information gathering sessions.
6. OSCA Standardized Court forms (both JIS and manual forms) - This review allowed the team to pre-populate a list of the courts’ information exchanges. This list was confirmed during and after the information gathering sessions.
7. OSCA’s Missouri Court Clerk Handbook - This review allowed the team to pre-populate a list of the courts’ information exchanges. This list was confirmed during and after the information gathering sessions.

A face-to-face information gathering session was then conducted at the participant’s site. These sessions typically lasted from two to four hours. A facilitator led each session and a scribe captured the minutes. All sessions were conducted on the date scheduled, regardless of participant availability.

After the session, the Tier Team documented the information gathered. All information was documented in a Microsoft Word document, with the exception of the information exchange points. The information exchange points were documented in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Follow up telephone calls, emails and meetings occurred to gather information not obtained during the session due to time constraints or because the resource with the information was not available. This information was added to the two documents and sent to the participants for review and approval.

Analysis was done to develop a standardized set of information exchanges for Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Courts, and Department of Corrections - Incarceration, Probation and Parole. A cross reference was then created between the individual information exchanges of each agency and the standardized set. The standardized set of information exchanges for all justice domains were then merged and entered into the JIEM tool.

The results of all information gathering sessions were analyzed and summarized to prepare this report. The spreadsheets for each participating agency and the cross reference between the



standardized set of information exchanges are not included in this document but have been delivered to the Office of Information Technology's Project Manager.

## D. Review Assumptions

The review was conducted under the following assumptions:

1. Participants for each criminal justice agency would supply correct and complete information on their information exchange points and business drivers.
2. Participants for each criminal justice agency would supply correct and complete information on their technical environment, current application systems, and staff technical capabilities.
3. Participants for each criminal justice agency would supply correct and complete information on current outside providers of software, and their ability to meet current needs.
4. Tier was not required to interpret statutory or regulatory constraints and was not required to search for those constraints. The participants would supply this information before, during and/or after the information gathering sessions.
5. The justice agencies selected by the Missouri Justice Integration Team were a representative sample of justice agencies across the State.
6. Minutes and information exchanges were considered approved if the participants did not respond with changes by the time this study was delivered to the State.

## E. Recommendations

This study is a high-level assessment of the state of justice information sharing in the State of Missouri. As such, the study is a good "next step" in determining how to improve the exchange of justice information both at the local and the state level.

The criminal justice agencies interviewed are representative of the criminal justice agencies statewide, but as there are other agencies, the information gathered and reported may not be inclusive of all of the issues facing all of the criminal justice agencies in Missouri. Additionally, other agencies, external to the criminal justice agencies (such as Central Dispatch, Department of Social Services and Mental Health), were not included in the scope of this study per the contractual agreement with Tier. In order to develop a truly integrated justice environment for the State of Missouri, these other agencies may need to be examined from the perspective of their interaction with Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, Courts, Department of Correction's Incarceration, Probation, and Parole.

An examination of the business drivers reveals there is a definite demand and need for information sharing. Resolution of even a single issue would greatly enhance and streamline the administration of justice in the State of Missouri.





Although there is a substantial number of computer systems in place and IT staff to support and engage in external information sharing, the study reveals that the technology infrastructure is not yet ready to support information sharing. There is still a need to resolve numerous technology and procedural issues. For example, disparate systems (e.g., hardware, software, databases, etc.) will complicate integration efforts. System standardization, however, is only part of the solution. Technology solutions are driven by the need to further examine procedural and business practices surrounding the business drivers identified in this study.

The data presented in this report (existing information exchanges, critical business drivers and the state of technology) provides the State of Missouri with information necessary to proceed to the next step of improving the exchange of information among state and local justice agencies. Specific goals and objectives (i.e., resolution of individual business drivers and/or technology issues) can now be established for either an expanded assessment study to address agencies not covered under the PAQ, and/or development of cross-agency data sharing standards and procedures for the information exchanges identified in this study.

Standardization on a relatively small number of computer application systems deployed on a standard hardware, operating system, and database architecture within the Law Enforcement, Jails, Prosecutor, and Court disciplines would reduce the overall cost of implementing an integrated criminal justice system from a state-wide perspective. MDOC is not included in this list because of their OPII system. The increasing demands for enhanced level of data exchange and system integration will put additional strains on existing systems and processes and will require substantial investments to satisfy the demands. Additionally, there are many criminal justice agencies that do not have computer application systems but will need them to reach the ultimate goal of a state-wide criminal justice system. It will be important for them to procure a standardized technical solution.

There may be substantial benefits by coordinating and standardizing a solution or relatively few solutions for each of the disciplines. It is believed that economy of scale could be realized if this was done. If the agencies perform the automation projects independently, the total cost of doing will be enormous. This cost can be reduced dramatically through the coordination and leveraging of efforts, and standardization of work-products.

Additionally, to reduce cost of the total effort it is important to build upon projects that have already been developed, are in progress, or currently planned. An example would be the repository for the municipal arrest and incident information. Should the CHRS be enhanced to include this data or should a separate repository be built? There are valid arguments on both sides of this question. In order to answer this question and many others like it, objective cost/benefit analysis must be completed.

## F. Project Participation

The MJIT identified the following criminal justice agencies as participants for the Justice Information Sharing Study. These agencies were selected as a representative sample of the State

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



of Missouri. The sample included the following small, medium and large criminal justice agencies:

#### Municipal Law Enforcement

- Brookfield Police Department (small)
- Belton Police Department (medium)
- Springfield Police Department (large)

#### County Law Enforcement

- Pemiscot County Sheriff's Department (small)
- Camden County Sheriff's Department (medium)
- Johnson County Sheriff's Department (medium)
- Greene County Sheriff's Department (large)

#### Other Law Enforcement

- ALERT (Kansas City Police Department)
- MSHP (Technical Services Bureau)
- REJIS (Town & Country, University Police, Florissant Police/Major Case Squad, Chesterfield Police, Shrewsbury Police, Berkeley Police, St. Louis County, Justice Services – Booking & Jail for County, St. Louis Metropolitan, and Justice Services – Booking & Jail for the City)

#### Municipal Prosecuting Attorneys

- Mt. Vernon Prosecuting Attorney (small)
- Columbia Prosecuting Attorney (medium)
- Kansas City Prosecuting Attorney (large)

#### County Prosecuting Attorneys

- Lawrence County Prosecuting Attorney (small)
- Clay County Prosecuting Attorney (medium)
- St. Louis County Prosecuting Attorney (large)

#### Other Prosecuting Attorney

- Attorney General's Office





### Municipal Courts

- Branson Municipal Court (small)
- Springfield Municipal Court (medium)
- Kansas City Municipal Court (large)

### County Courts

- Henry County Circuit Court (small)
- Boone County Circuit Court (medium)
- St. Louis County Circuit Court (large)

### Other Court

- Judicial Records Committee

### Missouri Department of Corrections

- Incarceration
- Probation
- Parole



Information contained in this Statewide Justice Information Sharing Report was gathered through focused face-to face sessions and follow-up telephone conversations with the following individuals. Their participation and input are acknowledged and greatly appreciated.

<b><u>Participant</u></b>	<b><u>Agency</u></b>
Abbott, Marsha	Henry County Circuit Court
Allred, Dane	REJIS/Justice Services
Allred, Kathleen	REJIS/Justice Services
Amos, Linda	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Anderson, Mark	Greene County Sheriff's Department
Anderson, Tim	Attorney General's Office
Baker, L. June	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Baker, Meredith	OSCA
Barber, Jim	Greene County Sheriff's Department
Barnes, LaVerta	REJIS/DOC (St. Louis City)
Belman, Jon	St. Louis County Police Department
Bennett, Rick	ALERT
Bowling, Gary	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Brooks, Pat	OSCA
Buechter, Vic	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Bunnell, Tom	Brookfield Police Department
Buse, Nora	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Carter, Jerry	Pemiscot County Sheriff's Department
Cavener, Dave	Greene Count (Information Systems)
Clayton, Kenneth	Greene County Sheriff's Department
Coffey, Richard	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Coleman, Tammy	Henry County Circuit Court
Colwell, Cynthia	ALERT
Connolly, John	REJIS/Normandy Police Department
Crecelius, Robert	REJIS/DOC (St. Louis City probation)
Curtis, Kirby	Johnson County Sheriff's Department
Daniels, Linda	ALERT
Deardeuff, Jerline	Missouri Department of Corrections
Demski, Matt	Clay County Circuit Court
Dolliver, Linda	Boone County Circuit Court
Dougherty, Mark	REJIS/St. Louis County Police Department
Duerden, Heather	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Eden, Steve	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Dunigan, Bob	REJIS/St. Louis Police Department
Edwards, David	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Elder, L. D.	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Evans, J. D.	St. Louis County Prosecuting Attorney's Office

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax

**Participant****Agency**

Garnett, Melody	Boone County Circuit Court
Garr, Bob	Brookfield Police Department
George, Robert	Lawrence County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
German, Rick	Brookfield Police Department
Glenn, David	Greene County Sheriff's Department
Greenwell, Tommy	Pemiscot County Sheriff's Department
Griggs, Nancy	OSCA
Gronauer, Cliff	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Hager, Andy	Mt. Vernon Prosecuting Attorney's Office
Hamilton, Steve	Springfield Police Department
Hane, David	Brookfield Police Department
Hanes, Mike	Johnson County Sheriff's Department
Harman, Terri	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Harmon, Kathy	Johnson County Sheriff's Department
Hayes, Denny	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Heimberger, Bob	REJIS/St. Louis Police Department
Heiss, Chuck	Johnson County Sheriff's Department
Helms, Tony	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Hensley, Janet	Missouri Department of Corrections
Hillhouse, Lori	Lawrence County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
Hodges, Alex	ALERT
Hoerrman, Carla	Brookfield Police Department
Hooten, Sherry	Henry County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
Huhn, Teresa	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Hull, Kim	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Hyder, Rob	Clinton Police Department
Jarvis, Mike	REJIS/St. Louis Police Department
Jauer, Bob	REJIS
Joachimstaler, Roy	REJIS/St. Louis Police Department
Jones, Lori	Clinton County Central Dispatch
Jurensmeier, Cathy	Henry County Circuit Court
Keller, Jeff	REJIS/ Shrewsbury PD
Kerr, Jess	Greene County (Information Systems)
Krebs, Phil	Springfield Municipal Court
Kuehl, Robert	ALERT
Lloyd, Kathy	Boone County Circuit Court
Lueckenhoff, Larry	Missouri State Highway Patrol
McGhee, Wendi	Henry County Circuit Court
McInerney, Vince	ALERT
McMenemy, Randi	Probation and Parole
Merritt, Jack	Greene County Sheriff's Department
Messerli, Karen	OSCA

**Participant****Agency**

Milam, Terry	REJIS/St. John Police Department
Murano, Beth	Kansas City Prosecuting Attorney's Office
Nelson, Don	Kansas City Municipal Court
Newhouse, Paul	REJIS
Norris, Don	Clay County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
Nutt, Valerie	ALERT
Oberkrom, J. Kent	Henry County Sheriff's Department
Page, John	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Parrish, John	State Judicial Records Committee
Perry, Robert	Boone County Circuit Court
Person, James	Belton Police Department
Pickering, Chris	Attorney General's Office
Piper, Janice	Springfield Municipal Court
Podolak, John	REJIS/St. Louis Police Department
Pudlowski, David	REJIS/St. Louis County Police Department
Roberts, Jim	Clay County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
Roberts, William	Henry County Circuit Court
Rodgers, Paige	Springfield Police Department
Rowe, Lynn	Springfield Police Department
Russell, Mike	ALERT
Schneider, Bernard	Kansas City Municipal Court
Schulte, Dave	Missouri Department of Corrections
Sciole, Dominic	ITD
Sheperd, Stephanie	Missouri Department of Corrections
Shriver, Norman	Belton Police Department
Spears, Don	Belton Police Department
Stewart, Ron	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Struempf, Nancy	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Tallman, Stephanie	Probation and Parole District 3
Thomas Motley, Thomas	Branson Municipal Court
Thorson, Tom	Greene County (Information Systems)
Trachsel, Bill	REJIS/Justice Services
Vogel, Mandy	Henry County Municipal Court
Westfall, Lisa	Branson Municipal Court
White, Larry	REJIS
Wibbenmeyer, Rose	Columbia Prosecuting Attorney's Office
Williams, Harriett	Kansas City Police Department/ALERT
Williams, John B.	Kansas City Municipal Court
Williams, Karen	Camden County Sheriff's Department
Wilson, Beth	Clinton County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
Wolken, Carrie	OCSA
York, Laura	Greene County Sheriff's Department



Tier would like to thank Debbie Tedeschi, OIT, for her guidance and project management, Robert Bowers, OSCA, for his contract administration, Karen Messerli, OSCA, for her participant selection and coordination support, and the following members of the MIJT for their guidance, participant selection, and review of the study.

<b><u>MIJT Member</u></b>	<b><u>Agency</u></b>
Mr. Mike Buenger, Chair	Office of State Courts Administrator
Mr. Brett Fischer	Office of Administration
Captain Tim McGrail	Missouri State Highway Patrol
Mr. Dave Schulte	Department of Corrections
Honorable John Parrish	State Judicial Records Committee
Mr. Tim Anderson	Office of Attorney General
Mr. Mike Wright	Missouri Association of Prosecuting Attorneys
Mr. David Brown	Department of Public Safety
Sheriff John Page	Missouri Sheriff's Association
Chief Jim Person	Missouri Police Chief's Association
Mr. Paul Newhouse	Regional Justice Information Sharing
Ms. Liz Ziegler	Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Major Vince McInerney	Kansas City Police Department
Mr. Gerry Wethington	Office of Information Technology

## G. Tier & ACS Project Team

Tier & ACS provided a team of consultants who are experienced in assisting organizations with the integration of disparate systems – particularly government organizations engaging in justice systems integration.

Tier Team:

- Lucy Watts, Team Project Manager
- Dave Beman, Team Lead for Prosecutors
- Sean Mullin, Team Lead for MDOC Incarceration
- Deborah Stafford, Scribe & JIEM Specialist
- Craig Stepno, Team Lead for Law Enforcement

ACS Team:

- Susan Bates, ACS Advisory Manager
- Gil Bensinger, ACS Project Manager
- Christie Holman, Consultant Manager
- Lesley Osborne, Courts Consultant
- Derik Rubsch, Lead Software Engineer
- Gloria Schwartz, P&P Consultant
- Angela Sidwell, Lead Software Engineer



## **II. Study Findings: Law Enforcement**

### **Business Drivers**

Law Enforcement study participants identified the following Enablers, Inhibitors, and Critical Success Factors during the information process:

#### **Enablers**

1. There is a new, shared willingness among local Law Enforcement to be proactive in providing access to justice data, and it is fostering new county wide or regional efforts to enhance justice information sharing.
2. Access to incident and arrest data on a regional basis is viewed as an important justice information sharing enabler. Regional examples offered were REJIS in the eastern part of the state, and ALERT and the ITI vendor-driven initiative in the western part of the state.
3. The Missouri Police Chiefs Association is in support of municipal arrest and incident data being centralized, either in the Criminal History Records System (CHRS), or in a second repository created for this information. This is seen as a critical enabler.
4. The expanded growth of mobile access to the various local area records management systems (RMS), incident reports, and MULES using mobile data terminals or wireless laptops is considered a significant enabler.
5. The continued state effort to upgrade the various MSHP records access systems such as MULES 2 and MULES 3 is highlighted as a justice exchange success story.
6. The successful deployment of automated records management systems by local Law Enforcement, especially next generation relational systems, is viewed as a significant enabler.

#### **Inhibitors**

1. The inability to easily access the data contained in the local Law Enforcement RMS on a regional or statewide basis is seen as inhibiting justice information exchanges.
2. The new willingness to share data has not totally replaced the historical unwillingness to share data and overcome the protective “it’s my data” barrier.
3. A significant barrier to justice information exchanges identified is the lack of willingness by state entities to comply with statutory requirements allowing access to their data.
4. From a future planning perspective, the use of a pointer system, rather than access to an RMS database, is considered an inadequate substitute.
5. The current policy governing the definitions of justice information and the information stored in the CHRS is viewed as too narrow, due to the exclusion of municipal arrest and incident data.

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



6. Legislation that enables civilian agencies to have access to data for background checks but restricts local Law Enforcement access is seen as a severe inhibitor.
7. The current MSHP technical environment does not support direct electronic submission of the various records formatted and generated by vendors for local Law Enforcement.
8. The current focus on Morpho-provided Livescan equipment options and the fees associated with acquiring this equipment without providing state sanctioned alternative option(s) is seen as an inhibitor.
9. Information sharing with Probation and Parole (P& P) for incident investigation and planning for an offender's reintroduction to a community is seen as deficient and/or too guarded or restrictive.
10. At this time, Homeland Security initiatives are more of a strain on local Law Enforcement resources, with little or no gain in justice information sharing at the local level. Funding for justice information sharing is not reaching down to the local level.
11. The current system for entering and sharing of warrant information has four inhibitors:
  - a. The untimely entry of new warrants;
  - b. The failure to remove inactive warrants;
  - c. The requirement to manually re-enter the warrants into MULES after they are issued by the Courts; and
  - d. The unavailability to track warrants served from a Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) point of view.
12. Until all justice agencies embrace the use of accurate National Crime Information Center (NCIC) charge codes as part of their normal exchange routine, especially at the Court level, efforts to attain a true disposition supported exchange is hindered.
13. With each changing mandate as to "who can" and "can not" have access to criminal justice data, Law Enforcement is constantly being put into a reactive position in terms of access and justice information sharing.

### **Critical Success Factors**

1. Additional State funding for local Law Enforcement technologies is needed.
2. Federal approvals for Missouri grant applications for funding to enhance justice information planning, sharing, and system development is needed.

### **Appropriate and Hindering Constraints**

The following statutes were cited by both local Law Enforcement and MSHP as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies:



## **Chapter 610 RSMo – Governmental Bodies and Records**

### **§ 610.011 RSMO – Liberal construction of law to be public policy**

Generally referred to as the “Sunshine Law”, this section requires that meetings, records, votes, actions, and deliberations of public governmental bodies be open to the public unless otherwise provided by law.

The following statutes were cited by the MSHP Records Section as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies:

## **Chapter 43 RSMo State Highway Patrol**

### **§ 43.250 RSMo – Law enforcement officers to file accident reports with patrol, when**

This section specifies that every law enforcement officer who investigates a vehicle accident resulting in injury to or death of a person, or total property damage to an apparent extent of five hundred dollars or more to one person, shall forward a written report to the Patrol within ten days after the investigation.

### **§ 43.251 RSMo – Report forms—how provided, contents, approval by superintendent**

This section authorizes the Missouri Division of Highway Safety to prepare and distribute accident report forms for use by Law Enforcement.

### **§ 43.270 RSMo –Criminal justice network and technology revolving fund, purpose**

This section creates the “Criminal Justice Network and Technology Revolving Fund” within the state treasury and establishes MSHP as the administrator.

### **§ 43.401 RSMo – Reports, information to be included, entry of data into computer systems--patrol to be notified, when--report to be maintained as record during investigation**

This section requires that a report of the complaint of a missing person be immediately entered into MULES and NCIC by the Law Enforcement agency receiving the complaint, and disseminated to other Law Enforcement agencies that may come in contact with or is involved in the investigation or location of a missing person.

### **§ 43.410 RSMo– Coroner to furnish fingerprints and dental records of certain deceased to highway patrol—duties of patrol—medical and dental records of missing child to be furnished to patrol**

This section requires every county coroner or medical examiner to promptly furnish MSHP with copies of fingerprints on standardized fingerprint cards, personal descriptions and other identifying data, including date and place of death.





## **Chapter 43 RSMo, Sections §500-540 Criminal History Record Information (CHRI)**

### **§ 43.500 RSMo- Definitions**

This section defines "criminal history record information" as the information collected by criminal justice agencies on individuals consisting of "identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, information, or other formal criminal charges, and any disposition arising from, sentencing, correctional supervision, and release."

### **§ 43.503 RSMo Arrest, charge and disposition of misdemeanors and felonies to be sent to highway patrol.**

This section requires all police officers, the clerk of each Court, MDOC, the Sheriff of each county, the chief Law Enforcement official of a city not within a county and the Prosecuting Attorney of each county or the circuit attorney of a city not within a county to submit certain criminal arrest, charge, and disposition information to the central repository for filing without undue delay, in the form and manner required by sections §43.500 to 43.530.

### **§ 43.504 RSMo – Access to central repository by private entities responsible for probation services --restrictions**

This section specifies that when the term of probation (under §559.600 to 559.615, RSMo) is completed or when the material is no longer needed for purposes related to the probation, it shall be returned to the Court or destroyed. The private entities shall not use or make this information available to any other person for any other purpose.

### **§ 43.505 RSMo – Uniform crime reporting system established--duties of department--violations, penalty**

This section governs the establishment of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) System, the role of the Department of Public Safety as the administrator and their requirements to publish and maintain statistics.

### **§ 43.506 RSMo – Crimes to be reported, exceptions--method of reporting--repository of latent prints.**

This section defines the crimes to be reported as all felonies and serious or aggravated misdemeanors consistent with the reporting standards established by the National Crime Information Center, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), for the Federal Interstate Identification Index System. In addition, all cases arising pursuant to sections §566.010 to 566.141, RSMo, where the defendant pleads guilty to an offense involving a child less than seventeen years of age and the Court imposes a suspended imposition of sentence shall be reported.

This section also allows for electronic reporting and establishes a repository for latent prints.



**§ 43.507 RSMo – Disclosure of criminal history, who may receive**

This section establishes permissions for persons other than Law Enforcement officials to receive criminal history information.

**§ 43.509 RSMo – Rule making authority, department of public safety—rulemaking procedure**

This section vests rule making authority for the criminal history records statutes with the Director of the Department of Public Safety. The Director is empowered to establish such rules and regulations as are necessary to implement the provisions of sections § 43.500 to 43.530.

**§ 43.512 RSMo – Charge Code manual, publication, use**

This section specifies that the central repository, with the approval of the Supreme Court, shall publish and make available to criminal justice officials, a standard manual of codes for all offenses in Missouri.

**§ 43.518 RSMo – "Criminal records and justice information advisory committee", established--purpose---members--meetings, quorum----minutes, distribution, filing of**

This section established within the department of public safety a "Criminal Records and Justice Information Advisory Committee" whose purpose is to:

1. Recommend general policies with respect to the philosophy, concept and operational principles of the Missouri criminal history record information system established by §43.500 to 43.530 RSMo for collecting and disseminating criminal history; and
2. Assess the current state of electronic justice information sharing; and
3. Recommend policies and strategies, including standards and technology, for promoting electronic justice information sharing, and coordinating among the necessary agencies and institutions; and
4. Provide guidance regarding the use of any state or federal funds appropriated for promoting electronic justice information sharing.

**§ 43.545 RSMo- Highway patrol to include reported incidents of domestic violence in crime index**

This section allows MSHP to include in its voluntary system of reporting for compilation in the "Missouri Crime Index" all reported incidents of domestic violence, whether or not an arrest is made on forms provided by MSHP and in a manner prescribed by MSHP.



### **Chapter 221 RSMo- Jails and Jailers**

#### **§ 221.510 RSMo- Pending outstanding warrants in MULES and NCIC systems, inquiry conducted, when (Jakes Law)**

This requires Law Enforcement officials, jailers and MDOC to conduct checks for outstanding warrant in the MULES and NCIC systems before an inmate is released from custody.

### **Chapter 577 RSMo – Public Safety Offenses**

#### **§ 577.051 RSMo – Missouri uniform law enforcement system records, information entered by the highway patrol, when, made available, to whom—failure to furnish records to patrol, penalty—forms and procedures for filing records**

This section governs final dispositions for Driving Under the Influence (DUI), the record information entered by MSHP or the Department of Revenue (DOR) into MULES, when they are to be entered, what can be made available, to whom, and penalties for failure to furnish records to the MSHP.

### **Chapter 589 RSMo – Crime Prevention and Control Programs and Services**

#### **§ 589.400 RSMo – Registration of certain offenders with chief law officers of county of residence--time limitation--cities may request copy of registration**

This section establishes categories of offenders who are required to register as a sex offender and it established the 10-day registration requirement.

#### **§ 589.403 RSMo – Correctional facility or mental health institution releasing on parole discharge, official in charge, duties**

This section covers correctional facility or mental health institution releasing on parole or discharge, official in charge, duties.

#### **§ 589.405 RSMo– Court’s Duties upon release of a sexual offender**

This section requires the Courts to inform offenders prior to release of their duties to register as sexual/predatory offenders.

#### **§ 589.407 RSMo – Registration, required information**

This section governs the registration process, the form and the required information to be reported by sex offenders.



**§ 589.410 RSMo– Highway Patrol to be notified, information to be made part of MULES**

This section establishes the requirement for chief law officers of a county to forward sex offender registrations to MSHP and allows information to be made part of MULES.

**§ 589.414 RSMo– Registrants duties on change of address—time limitations for certain notifications**

This section outlines a registrant's (predatory or sexual offender) reporting duties for change of address-time limitations for certain notification.

**§ 589.417 RSMo– Statements, photographs and fingerprints not to be public record-disclosure authorized for law enforcement officials and agencies --complete list of offenders named --released upon request.**

This section exempts certain statements, photographs and fingerprints of sex offenders from the public record provisions of Chapter 610 (Sunshine Law). However, it does permit disclosure to authorized Law Enforcement officials and agencies.

**§ 589.420 RSMo– Temporary assignment outside correctional facility or mental health institution--official in charge to notify before release--exception**

This section covers temporary assignment outside correctional facility or mental health institution – officials in charge to notify chief law enforcement before release- exceptions.

**Legislation Pending At Time of Interview**

**Senate Bill 184** - the Governor signed the bill on July 11, 2003. The new law:

1. Repeals a section of law prohibiting the fingerprinting of a juvenile.
2. Requires MSHP, upon appropriation, to post a statewide sexual offender list on the Internet. This will allow the public to search for registered sexual offenders by name, zip code and mile radius from any address. This act does limit the amount of information about a registered sexual offender to a photograph, name, address and crime committed.
3. Allows any two or more political subdivisions and MSHP to cooperate to form a multi-jurisdictional enforcement group for the investigation of computer and Internet law violations.
4. Expands the list of entities that may access closed records. A criminal justice agency receiving a request for criminal history information may require fingerprints prior to releasing closed record information.

The following Codes of State Regulations were cited by the MSHP as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies:



**Division 30 Director's Office Chapter - 4 Missouri Criminal Records Repository (MCRR) and Privacy/Security Information**

- 11 CSR – 30-4.010 – Definitions
- 11 CSR – 30-4.020 – Agencies & persons required to furnish CHRI
- 11 CSR – 30-4.030 – Police agency procedures
- 11 CSR – 30-4.040 – Prosecuting and Circuit Attorney procedures
- 11 CSR – 30-4.050 – Court Clerk procedures
- 11 CSR – 30-4.060 – Department of Corrections procedures
- 11 CSR – 30-4.070 – Dissemination of CHRI for statistical purposes
- 11 CSR – 30-4.080 – Reporting to CHRI to MCRR via electronic medium
- 11 CSR – 30-4.090 – Privacy and Security requirements

The following Code of Federal Regulations is cited as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies.

**28 CFR (Chapter 23)** – The Code of Federal Regulations governing release of confidential records and the use of NCIC access for background checks.

MSHP publishes the following list of methodology guides for each of the contributing entities. These include the following Identification Methodology Manuals and Flow Charts:

1. Methodology for finger print ID - criminal
2. Applicant fingerprint methodology
3. Disposition methodology
4. Penitentiary Face Sheets methodology
5. Parole release methodology
6. Offender registration
7. Manual name check
8. Name check with disk methodology
9. Charge code methodology
10. Crime summary



Other published user guides that govern methods of submission, conditions, and layout of data fields include the following MSHP Disposition Submission Packets (protocol) for:

1. Prosecuting Attorneys
2. Courts
3. Corrections
4. Corrections Interface Sheets

### **Stakeholder Recommendations**

The Law Enforcement study participants made a number of recommendations that centered primarily on information needed for investigative purposes, but not available to them, either due to statute limitations or because an information database does not exist. Each recommendation, along with supporting comments, is documented in the following section of the report. Recommendations are not attributed to individual participants making the suggestion. Rather, the list is presented as a consolidated listing of recommendations made by Law Enforcement officials that participated in the information gathering process. No attempt has been made to prioritize the recommendations.

1. Encourage further development of regional and/or statewide repositories for municipal arrest and incident information, including the possible use of data warehousing as a way to enhance justice information sharing between Law Enforcement agencies. Special emphasis should be placed on the timely data entry to any such repository.
2. Efforts should be made to incorporate the new internet technologies and search capabilities that are now available in the commercial world for application to justice information sharing; especially the concept of a “Google™” type search of records management systems for the desired justice information about an individual.
3. Review the entire warrant management process to ensure that the sharing of warrant information is based on the following business process assumptions:
  - a. Redundant entry by local Law Enforcement and the Courts can be eliminated.
  - b. New entries will be timely so that queries will return accurate results.
  - c. Inactive warrants will be deleted on a timely basis.
  - d. All justice agencies should be able to ascertain electronically when a warrant has been acted on.
4. Allow Law Enforcement agencies greater access to MDOC information, including but not limited to, a direct electronic interface. MDOC has a wealth of information not being fully tapped – especially conditional release information and/or information about disciplinary actions for an individual. If this information could be made available, it would greatly enhance investigations and justice information sharing.



5. The current business process for Offense Cycle Number (OCN) assignment needs to be improved to ensure that only one identifying number is associated with one person and one event.

This level of tracking continuity has not been attained due to duplication and conflicts on multiple OCNs for the same person and same event.

6. The current business practices for disposition reporting by Prosecutors and Courts needs to be reviewed. Current disposition reporting requirements, as required by state statutes, are not being followed. Procedures need to be identified, including sanctions for non-compliance, or the establishment of new requirements if necessary, to ensure the timely and complete reporting of disposition information.
7. The current business rules governing access to P&P information by Law Enforcement, and existing practices need to be reviewed to ensure and/or establish the following:
  - a. Information regarding the dangerousness of a subject when a pick-up order is issued;
  - b. Access to Pre-Sentence Investigation reports;
  - c. Access to P&P Violation reports;
  - d. Notification when a P&P Warrant is issued, as this becomes a housing issue for local jails;
  - e. Availability of P&P staff to confirm warrants during non-business hours. If a warrant can't be confirmed, the subject must be released; and
  - f. Prohibit P&P officers from accepting "word of mouth warrants" from other jurisdictions. Documentation needs to be received, as the Sheriff's Department can't hold a subject without written authorization.
8. Efforts to automate the Courts should be continued, with an added focus on sharing justice information that directly impacts Law Enforcement (i.e. electronic access to Court schedules, automatic notification of court date changes, timely notification of warrant creation, electronic copies of warrants and electronic disposition reporting).
9. Provide any Law Enforcement agency that has an ORI direct and/or more expedited access to all external databases. Agencies must go through MSHP to get to federal databases, and often wait several days to get responses.
10. Flexibility similar to the code 80 used by MSHP officers should be extended to local Law Enforcement, so they can inquire on a subject without providing a reason code.
11. The state should help fund the development and implementation of a true integrated county system to enhance justice information sharing. Under such a system, there would be a unified approach to calling up and reading reports, editing incident information, having the ability to see what investigations were under way in any agency within the county. All officers should have mobile data terminals (MDTs) and/or mobile laptop capabilities.
12. Establish a statewide gun permit database to enhance and/or improve incident investigations.





13. Develop state standards for management of county jails, the records associated with managing inmates, and the exchanges of information contained in those documents.
14. The existing business practices for registering out-of-state sex offenders needs to be reviewed. There is a loophole in the current law that allows sex offenders moving to Missouri from other states not to be fingerprinted.
15. Encourage the Courts to use the full charge codes as published, with NCIC identifier codes included. Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA) does not currently use the NCIC identifiers that are listed in published charge codes.
16. Review the business practices associated with agencies updating their systems in order to have the most current charge codes and establish a best practice for ensuring that all agencies have access to, and are using the most current charge codes. Agencies are not retiring old charge codes, and continue using them when they are not valid.
17. Find a way to protect Law Enforcement investigations so they will not be jeopardized when P & P receives MULES hits when Law Enforcement makes queries on a probationer or parolee.
18. The 20-hour hold rule does not work well for law enforcement agencies, especially when you factor in weekends, holidays and end of day activity. It is recommended that it be replaced by a 48-hour hold rule.

### **Other Stakeholder Recommendations**

The Law Enforcement study participants made a number of recommendations relative to the sharing of justice information; however, either the other agencies involved were not justice agencies, or the subject matter is beyond the scope of this study. Due to the importance collectively placed on these exchanges, those recommendations are include here under “Other Stakeholder Recommendations,” as this information ultimately may become part of a justice information exchange.

1. Other state employees (child support enforcement, etc.) can obtain information from many agencies that Law Enforcement can't. The statutes/regulations/policies need to be changed to allow Law Enforcement to obtain information from the following agencies for the purposes of investigations and civil process:
  - a. Child Support Enforcement;
  - b. Social Security Administration;
  - c. Division of Family Services;
  - d. United States Postal Service;
  - e. Utility companies;



- f. Substance abuse treatment facilities and medical centers. They will not release information (access vs. privacy) due to HIPPA and other restrictions. Investigators do not always have access to information that could assist in an investigation. Accused persons can and do seek shelter from prosecution and/or investigation by being admitted into facilities that are governed by HIPPA information exchange regulations.
2. The current restrictions on local Law Enforcement's access to MULES for employment background checks for anyone other than their own candidates is seen as too restrictive and hindering broader and timelier exchanges of justice information.
3. Expand the current authority that allows Law Enforcement agencies to conduct background checks on their own applicants to include background checks for potential employees of any department within their community. Also, expand their authority to conduct background checks for other statutorily mandated categories of background checks.

### **Technology Assessment**

The technology available to Law Enforcement agencies participating in this study varies widely, but at minimum, all have a records management system and those administering a jail also have automated jail management systems.

- 7 of 7 Law Enforcement agencies have automated records management systems;
- Only 2 of 7 currently have deployed MDTs or laptops;
- 4 of 4 jails have at least a basic automated jail management system;
- 1 of 4 police departments is currently a contributor to a regional repository;
- Only 1 of 4 sheriffs departments are served by the county IS/IT staffs;
- None of the agencies have interfaces to the Prosecuting Attorneys' Offices, P&P, MDOC or the Courts;
- Other than MULES, most information requests to the agencies are answered by fax (if it is small enough to fax), letter (if it is too big to fax), or through an in person pick-up (if it is too big and too costly to mail);
- Each agency only has 1-2 IT/IS staff assigned;
- The depth of IT/IS staff training and certification ranges from self-taught to formal certifications;
- There is little automated access to other Law Enforcement agencies other than through MULES - with the exception of those agencies that are contributors to ALERT or REJIS.

Although each agency retains vendors to support their records management applications, and jail management applications where applicable, the resources are used sparingly. The primary role of the identified vendors is to deliver new releases as contracted and to provide training on the applications.



The application vendors of record do not play a significant role in the agencies' annual or long range planning.

Vendors of record for network support or hardware and maintenance support are also used sparingly. In most agencies, services are procured strictly on an as-needed basis.

Although the Law Enforcement study participants are very supportive of any effort to support new and/or expanded justice information sharing, they have little or no resources to expend on new initiatives.

There is room for significant improvement in the use of technology in the Law Enforcement community. The most pressing need is for Law Enforcement to obtain real-time information.

### **Interagency Agreements**

Law Enforcement Study participants identified the following interagency agreements regarding integration and information exchanges::

- Memorandum of Understanding with MSHP for MULES access;
- The St. Louis County Circuit Clerk is responsible for disposition reporting to the CHRS, but the St. Louis County Prosecutor's Office reports the dispositions for the circuit clerk;
- Memorandum of Understanding regarding the use of ALERT;
- A signed agreement with The Mid-America Regional Council for Master 911 Answer Point Sub-Agreement;
- Mules Non-Terminal Agency Agreements;
- Contracts among agencies for MULES, dispatch, and Law Enforcement services;
- Regional data sharing agreement with ITI;
- Joint Communication Center Management Control Agreement for MULES/NCIC and user agencies;
- MULES/NCIC Operating Agreement (non terminal agencies);
- MULES Network Security System Operator/Authorization Form;
- USER Agency Agreement for MSHP's CJIS Information System Network (MULES/NCIC/NLETS);
- Policies and Standards for the Statewide CJIS Network & MULES;
- CJIS Security Policy;
- MSHP Qualification Packet MULES Connection Application;

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



- Livescan User Agency Agreement;
- Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) User Agency Agreement;
- MOU between the Missouri Criminal Records Identification Division and The National Crime Prevention and Privacy compact;

### **Existing Justice Information Systems**

Listed below are the Justice Information Systems used by each Law Enforcement study participant, with a description of those systems:

#### **ALERT -Kansas City Police Department (KCPD)**

- Bar-coding system for in-car video: Tracks the videos used in the patrol cars by date and time.
- “Bookem” Photo Imaging by EPIC: This system is used to photograph all booked individuals.
- CAD (currently being replaced by a new Tiburon System): A computer-aided-dispatch system that tracks calls and responses.
- Case Management System: Used to track investigations.
- Dragnet: Provides storage and retrieval capability on data received from the Drug Hotline phone calls.
- MULES: MULES facilitates queries between departments and MSHP, NCIC, and NLETS.
- Pawn Broker: A database of property purchased by participating pawnshops.
- Recovered property: Maintains an inventory of items recovered and/or held for evidence.
- Regional Crime Lab: Storage and tracking system for materials/cases handled by the KCPD Crime Laboratory.
- Report Imaging System/Kodak (will be replaced by new RMS/Tiburon system): Allows for scanning and indexing of documents.
- RMS (being replace by Tiburon system): The RMS stores data on wanted/missing persons, vehicles, arrests, traffic, field interviews, suspect and victim historical data, gangs, aliases, local sex offenders, and P&P information.
- STOP (Racial Profiling System): Allows KCPD to comply with state reporting requirements (will be marketed to other departments as a service in the near future).



#### Belton Police Department

- CAD/911 by ITI: The CAD/911 system uses computer-aided-dispatch to process calls and to handle emergency calls.
- Internet photo exchange system: Provides ability to send/receive digital photos.
- ITI Enterprise version (pending): This system will be the same as the Law Enforcement System.
- Law Enforcement System by ITI (site licenses): The Law Enforcement System provides the Department with a full RMS and arrest/booking/ information reporting, property, and dispatch modules.

#### Brookfield Police Department

- Law Enforcement Management System by ITI: Records management, photos, system backup, Query tool, Productivity Pack.

#### Camden County Sheriff's Department

- Law Enforcement Management System by ITI: Provides automation for Dispatch, Records management, Jail management, Civil process tracking, Pager tracking, Firearms Registration, Internal Email, Desk Book, Policies and Procedures, Department Property Inventory, queries and statistical reports.
- MULES: Access to MSHP, NCIC, and NLETS.

#### Greene County Sheriff's Department:

- County Archives System: All department records deemed eligible for archiving are stored on the county archive server.
- DBI Livescan System: The department is operating a 6-year-old Livescan workstation purchased from DBI. It is slated for replacement by Identix machine (DBI purchased by Identix) before the end of the calendar year. At this time the Livescan is a standalone system running off its own server. The current Livescan workstation is used to electronically capture the fingerprints of subject booked into the facility in lieu of the old ink and roll method of fingerprinting. It is not electronically interfaced to MSHP at this time. Although the prints are captured electronically and the fingerprint card with all demographics is printed out electronically, the actual fingerprint card that is produced from the system is mailed to the MSHP. The county information system staff have created an export routine that strips all required demographic data for a booked person (i.e. name address charge etc.) and sends this data to the workstation so that dual entry is not necessary.
- EPIC Photo System: EPIC photo imaging system is used to photograph subjects who are booked into the regional lockup and jail facility. The photo system is interfaced with the jail

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



management system and is also used to create electronic lineups. The photo imaging system is run off of a dedicated HP server. The Springfield Police Department can access the photos on line.

- **Law Enforcement and Records Management System:** The Law Enforcement and Record Management System were purchased approximately 15 years ago from BIS Systems. It was purchased with the source code. The “as purchased” system is no longer recognizable. The County IS staff have been customizing and upgrading the application for the last 15 years. Greene County has applied for an interagency grant, and if funds are awarded, will purchase a new records management software package. The county is very interested in the Tiburon system used by the City of Springfield. The primary menus and screens that are used by the department are: Records, Traffic, Dispatch, Field Intelligence, Search, Property, Intelligence, Civil Processing, Weapons Control, Warrant Officer, and Patrol. The Records menu provides access to the following screens and/or additional menus; Officer Activity, Arrest menu, Incident Reporting screen, Detectives Case menu, Utility menu, Print menus, Notice of Disposition screen, Probation and Parole History Checks, and the Administration menu. The Report menu provides access to the following; Census Report, FBI Report, Create a New Incident Number, Print Booking Sheet, and Print Incident events by class.
- **Mobile System:** The Department has 36 Mobile Data terminals (MDTs) installed in patrol cars. The MDTs allow patrol officers to make queries, enter limited incident information into an electronic report form, use (Cerulean) packet cluster software, and use disk loaded, Microsoft forms (which replicate the forms from the RMS) in order to enter the various reports they are required to file.
- **(Pending System):** The County Information Services Department is in the process of planning for a digital scanning system that will be used to scan all documents and forms related to inmates and to investigations in order to reduce the number of forms and the paper volume currently required for such record maintenance.

#### Johnson County Sheriff's Department

- Earthlink, via Sprint DSL: Internet access.
- **Law Enforcement and Records Management System by ITI:** Inmate property, facility property management, records management, CAD, roster, vehicle section, maintenance section, tape back-up, regional client switch, civil processing, queries, and license information.
- **VINES (Victim Information and Notification Everyday System):** Statutorily required Victim Notification system.



### Missouri State Highway Patrol

- CAD System-Logisys: Computer-aided-dispatch system that manages calls for service and response to calls.
- Commercial Driver's License System (CDL) Out of Service Drivers Module: System is used for enforcement in prosecuting commercial drivers who do not abide by 24-hour waiting period after violating CDL regulations.
- Crime Lab Evidence Management System: The system tracks evidence and produces appropriate reports for Courts and provides for statistical reporting.
- Criminal History Record System (CHRS): CHRS is a comprehensive integrated data system which is used to track arrest incidents, notations on crimes of violence, disposition reporting, dissemination of CHR information, record edits & additions, rap sheets and statistical reporting.
- Missouri Statewide Police Intelligence System Network (MoSPIN): A specifically designed system that provides users all functions needed for recording and retrieving intelligence information 24 hours a day.
- MORPHO AFIS: Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS).
- MULES 3 Orders of Protection (OOP): This system is used to track restraining orders.
- MULES: MULES 2 and MULES 3 combines stolen/wanted system, stolen vehicle system and missing person systems and collects, stores, retrieves information for all three, as well as provides access to NCIC and NLETS.
- NSOR (National Sex Offender Repository) Intranet module: This system acts as a front-end connection to the repository to allow authorized users to enter Missouri sex offenders and to update, cancel and clear Missouri sex offenders.
- Patrol Investigation System of Reporting (PISR): Captures arrests, narcotics, ECCO, forfeitures, seizures and data.
- Property Control Inventory System: The system is a statewide evidence system that allows for recording collection seized, maintaining chain of custody, items to Lab Evidence System, providing audits, and reports.
- Statewide Traffic Accident Record System: This system is used to track designated classes of auto accidents.
- Traffic Arrest System/Alcohol-Drug Offender Record System (TAS/ADORS): System tracks uniform complaints & summons, disposition information, entered and adjudicated DWI cases, and license revocation.
- Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Repository: This system is a web enabled central repository that allows agencies to report UCR statistics via the Internet.





### Pemiscot County Sheriff's Department

- Access database (developed in-house): Tracks affidavits, jail time forms, narrative for reports, arrest records.
- Sheriff's Office Management System (SOMS): Jail management and records management system.

### Springfield Police Department

- Automated Reporting System (ARS) by Tiburon: The ARS system is used to create the various components of a criminal record that are stored in the RMS system. It includes the Arrest, Incident, Person, Vehicle, Property, Modus Operandi, Narrative and Radio Call Report Writing, all of which are mirrored in the RMS.
- Citizen Contact Report System – wireless: This system allows officers to record information about contacts with citizens, and send the information wireless. The system is developed in-house using Microsoft Access.
- Crystal Reports: The department uses Crystal reports to query the Oracle database that is the back-end of the RMS system.
- Field Information Report System - wireless      This system allows officers to record information about persons of interest that they stop, and send the information wireless. The system is developed in-house using Microsoft Access.
- Mobile Laptops/Patrol cars: The officers use “automated reporting software” to complete reports in the field and then transmit them over the mobile data system.
- MULES: Criminal history information, wanted information, driving record information, missing person information, and access to NCIC and NLETS.
- PCR CAD/E911: Computer aided dispatch and E 911 Emergency Dispatch (A Printrak CAD system will replace PRC system in September).
- Records Management System (RMS) by Tiburon: The RMS system is used to manage and store the components of criminal records that are created through the ARS system.
- Traffic Data Collection System: Officers use this system each time they make a traffic stop to record information about the stop. They can forward it over the wireless mobile laptop system. The system is developed in-house using Microsoft Access.

### **Mode Of Information Exchanges**

The mode (manual vs. automated) of Law Enforcement information exchanges with external justice agencies is predominantly manual. Information sent from Law Enforcement to other Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, P&P, and MDOC is communicated via paper or phone calls.



## **Justice Agency Technical Environment and Technical Skills**

Listed below are the technical environments and description of agency technical skills for each Law Enforcement study participant:

### **ALERT -Kansas City Police Department (KCPD)**

- Technical environment: The KCPD technical environment is in the middle of a significant migration and change. Currently, the technical environment is based on an IBM mainframe with IMS and DB2 as the databases. The mainframe is owned and maintained by KCPD and the critical KCPD applications, including CAD and RMS, were all in-house developments. All of this is about to change. The catalyst for the transformation of the KCPD technical environment is the need for a new mainframe. They are currently evaluating the cost and feasibility of running all the police department and City applications on the City's IBM Z800 mainframe. Who will run and maintain the City's application has not yet been decided.

In addition to securing their mainframe upgrade, KCPD has also purchased a new Law Enforcement system from Tiburon that will replace the existing CAD, RMS, document imaging and other homegrown applications. The new Tiburon CAD will run on an isolated network dedicated to the dispatchers. RMS will run on the KCPD's existing network.

- Technical skills: KCPD currently employs 4 systems programmers, 13 application programmers dedicated to ALERT specific activity, 11 computer operations/mainframe technicians, 9 network operations staff to handle design, main servers, PS systems, and help desk support. There is also a staff of 28 dedicated to data entry. Their capabilities to make the transition to the new operating environment and Tiburon system were enhance by a recent new hire who is certified in A+, Network+, has CCNA, MCSE, MCP and has Cisco certifications.

### **Belton Police Department**

- Technical environment: The department's 3COM network is built and is maintained in-house. Currently there are 2 servers running windows 2000 and 36 PCs on the network. The ITI system uses a SQL database.
- Technical skills: Belton Police Department has one full-time technical staff person, and one part-time (16 hours per week) staff person. Belton Police Department's one full time IT staff person is Microsoft certified for networks but not for any database management system.

### **Brookfield Police Department**

- Technical environment: Brookfield Police Department is currently sharing access with other departments on the City of Brookfield's Windows 2000 server to run their ITI Law Enforcement Software. Access is gained through the citywide area network.

The overall environment can best be classified as minimal but functional and meeting all of their needs. Expansion is constricted by budget restraints/decisions.



- **Technical skills:** The technical skills for Brookfield Police Department staff are basically all self-taught. The only formal training the staff has received is the ITI system training given during the installation of the Law Enforcement Software. There is no formally trained database manager nor is there a formally trained network manager. There are 2 primary staff who are responsible for keeping the system operational.

#### Camden County Sheriff's Department

- **Technical Environment:** The ITI applications are running on 2 NT servers. The primary server is a generic, locally built server and the backup server is an IBM Netfinity server. The department is currently supporting 40 workstations. The department is not using MDTs or mobile laptops. Mobile service will depend on the success of the MSHP pilot that is testing various cell phone service providers and their options to support mobile computing from a patrol vehicle.

The 911 Dispatch Center has a separate network that is managed on an HP NT server.

The ITI software is being migrated from the FoxPro version of the software to the SQL based version. Conversion should be complete early next year.

The current network was installed in 1998 with the addition of a new facility. The department is connected to the Prosecuting Attorney's Office and the Courts with a fiber connection running off their router. This connection is for MULES access and is not used to exchange documents between the agencies.

The County IT/IS department does not service the Sheriff's Department.

- **Technical skills:** The Department has a total of two internal IT/IS staff; one the IT Supervisor (also Director of the 911 Dispatch Center) and the other, a new hire, will be responsible for maintaining hardware, software and networks.

The department skill sets are a combination of self-taught, ITI application specific training, and limited certifications. At the current time, there is no in-house SQL experience; this will be provided by ITI.

#### Greene County Sheriff's Department

- **Technical environment:** The Greene County IS staff is servicing approximately 150 desktop computers in addition to the MDTs. The jail and the Sheriff's Department are running a 100% fiber optic network. The LES/RMS system is run on an HP-K120– Unix based case series server with gigabit switching. The primary database platform is PIOPEN. MS Fox and Visual Basic are the primary programming languages. Info Basic and Visual basic are also being used for upgrades to applications.
- **Technical Skills:** The County IS staff is responsible for all programming, network administration, software installation, and hardware. The County IS staff is composed of 3 units that are managed by an IT Director. The units are:



- Application Systems Programming which is staffed by 1 manager and 6 midrange programmers – the programmers are both scientific and business degreed, who can do “any type of coding”.
- Computer Operations that is staffed by 1 manager, 4 technicians and a help desk operator.
- Telecommunications which is staffed by 1 manager, 1 midrange programmer and 1 IS technician
- The Information Systems staff are on call twenty-four hours a day, seven days per week for the Sheriff’s Department. The IT director estimates that he is providing the equivalent of 2 dedicated staff to the Sheriff’s Department on a full-time basis.

#### Johnson County Sheriff’s Department

- Technical environment: Johnson County Sheriff’s Department’s technical environment is built on 2 NT Servers - 1 of the NT servers hosts the Computer Aided Dispatch system (CAD) and the other servers runs the ITI software suite.
- Technical skills: Johnson County Sheriff’s Department technical staff primarily consists of 2 designated staff who have been trained on the ITI software. There are no formal database managers or network administrators. This is primarily a self-taught environment with Central Communications handling all installation work. The County IT staff does not provide services to the Sheriff’s Department.

#### Missouri State Highway Patrol

The MSHP technical services are provided by 8 administrative sections. They are:

- The Administrative Services Section provides training, writes grants, and manages purchases.
- Application Services Section is responsible for all non-CJIS application development work and support.
- CJIS Development Section is responsible for all CJIS related application development and support.
- The Distributed Processing Services Section has the primary responsibility for all platform and server support.
- The Network Services Section provides network support.
- Operations/Help Desk provides all user help and data center support.
- The PC Support Services Section is responsible for PC installs, peripheral installations and maintenance.
- The Statistical Analysis Center processes all requests for analysis and highway safety support.



### Pemiscot County Sheriff's Department

- **Technical Environment:** The agency's technical environment, with the exception of SOMS, can best be described as an in-house environment. There is a MULES interface. The Department, using self-taught staff, maintains the Department's network and operating environment as one of several segregated networks within the Justice Center (Courts and Prosecutor have separate systems and there is extensive duplication of network management equipment including 5 different routers). The geographic area of the Justice Center severely hinders the Department's potential technical growth. The primary phone service carrier has no plans to bring either DSL service or fiber optic cable to the area. The agency is forced to be very creative in order to overcome the lack of fiber and DSL capability by installing wireless networks from Cosmo Wireless for Internet access.
- **Technical skills:** There is one staff person responsible for all computer systems and programs. He has designed multiple systems using Microsoft Access and other software tools to enable the sheriff's office to implement management systems. He wrote all software applications for the Department prior to the purchase of SOMS.

### REJIS

- **Technical environment:** REJIS currently has a 192 MIP Enterprise Server (mainframe) that supports REJIS' different system images – three for REJIS and one for St. Louis County Government. Configured with disaster recovery options REJIS' Enterprise Server is the workhorse for many of REJIS' legacy and client/server development initiatives. REJIS' Data Center operates 24/7 365 days a year to ensure all services are monitored on an ongoing basis. The Data Center is capable of supporting not only REJIS' own operations but also centralized server operations for any number of other agencies.

Currently plans are under way to improve the Data Center services REJIS provides to its customers and the region. With the advent of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 and the ongoing concern for better security, REJIS has plans underway to construct a new hardened Data Center facility that will allow them to provide essential services to the criminal justice and government community in the event of a disaster. REJIS' efforts include working closely with the State of Missouri to ensure reciprocal services can be provided in the event of a disaster in Jefferson City or St. Louis.

REJIS supports five secured, Cisco PIX protected, dedicated T1 connections to the Internet at two locations, as well as several DSL, cable, and dial-up connections. REJIS' Internet development unit is responsible for the design, development and monitoring of over 12 websites.

Hardware, software and communications platforms supported by REJIS include:



- .NET
- Access
- Adobe Acrobat
- Adobe Photoshop
- ArcSDE/ArcIMS
- AS/400
- ASP
- ASP .NET
- Assembler
- C/C++/C#
- CDPD
- CICS
- Citrix MetaFrame
- Citrix Winframe
- Clarion
- COBOL
- Cold Fusion
- Cool:Gen
- Crystal Reports
- DB2
- ESL
- ESRI ArcGIS Software Suite
- ESRI Map Objects/Arc Objects
- Folio Views
- FoxPro
- Full suite of BMC based products
- Full suite of CA based products
- GML/VML
- IMS DB/DC
- Java
- Lotus Notes
- Mainframe/Enterprise Server products
- MapInfo Professional 7.0
- Microsoft Office Products
- MS SQL Server
- Novell
- NT
- OLAP
- Oracle
- OS/390
- Pocket PC 2002
- PowerBuilder
- S+
- SNA
- SQL Server CE
- SVG
- Sybase - Infomaker
- TCP/IP
- UNIX
- Visual Basic
- Webtrends Statistics Reports
- Win 9x/XP
- Windows 2000/2003
- Windows CE
- Windows Media Service
- Windows Server .NET
- WS-FTP
- XML
- Many standard off-the-shelf products

Client/server systems have been implemented in both LAN and WAN environments. REJIS' networks employ everything from dial-up and wireless to T1 and fiber. REJIS' development is concentrated on client/server systems, Internet, Intranet, Extranet, mainframe, and graphical user interface (GUI) access to legacy systems.

- **Technical skills:** The applications development department has a staff of 57 client/server, Internet/Intranet, and enterprise server (mainframe) developers. The network services department has a staff of 36 network technicians with knowledge in Cisco products, desktop/server installation and support, Microsoft products, Novell, frame relay, ISDN and VPN communications. REJIS' network technicians support all of the major servers and desktop operating systems including Microsoft, AS/400, SUN and Novell. Technical

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax





Services has a staff of nine who are responsible for data base administration, mainframe systems software and security. They have a seven person Help Desk, a 24/7 computer operations staff and two full-time and two part-time trainers. REJIS employs a technical staff for database management that includes skills in the most prevalent client/server and mainframe database technologies. REJIS has a staff of DBAs experienced in DB2, IMS DB, VSAM, Oracle, Access, and SQL Server database management systems. Support includes data modeling, database design, database implementation and all levels of backup and recovery.

### Springfield Police Department

- Technical environment:

Network. The network environment is a combination of Novell, 3COM, Cisco and Microsoft products. The City of Springfield's IS department manages the network for the Springfield Police Department. The City Network Manager is certified by Novell, Cisco, 3COM and Microsoft. The Springfield Police Department's network is running at a gigabyte between buildings and at 100 megabytes inside the buildings. The network is 100% fiber with a planned addition for wireless service within the main police department buildings. Externally, the Springfield Police Department is expanding its wireless network by installing Access Points at every fire department. The Access Points will, when fully installed, allow any officer to tie into any service that is on the city network. The Access Points will effectively overcome the narrowness of the RF bandwidth under which they are currently operating. Officers will be able to send email and have Internet connectivity from the patrol vehicles. In addition, officers will be able to receive and download any broadcast or files that have been sent, including photos.

Database Management. Oracle is the database product standard for the department with MS Access being used for some in-house development. The City of Springfield's IS Department is responsible for providing the Oracle database manager, who is fully certified by Oracle.

Servers. The City of Springfield's IS Department has a centralized server room that houses all the servers utilized by the Police Department. The City maintains the Network Server and a File Sharing Server. The Police Department manages several other dedicated servers within the central server room. The mobile data switch for the mobile laptop system is hosted on an NT server that also works in conjunction with a Unix box to manage radio data. The Tiburon RMS system runs on a HP 9000 Unix Server. The Tiburon ARS system for the laptops is hosted by 3 NT servers in a stacked array.

PCs and Mobile Laptops. Springfield Police Department is running approximately 200-plus desktops and 175 Panasonic mobile laptops. The city also services the 36 laptops used by the Sheriff's Department. However, the Sheriff's Department is not using the traffic report, citizen report or field report systems. Both departments are using the packet cluster software from Aether Mobile Government (formerly Cerulean).





- **Technical skills:** One full-time staff person administers the Springfield Police Department system, in addition to the city assistance referenced above. He is a Police Technician Specialist with 25 years of experience, and is responsible for all internal programming, maintenance and repairs. He is the in-house creator for mobile systems applications and is the designer and project manager for the installation of the new mobile remote Access Points that will expand the functionality of the Department's mobile laptop system. Mobile users will now have full remote access to any functionality available on the city network.

## **Outside Providers**

For each Law Enforcement study participant, listed below are the outside providers of software, products/service provided, and each provider's capability to respond to needs:

### ALERT – Kansas City Police Department (KCPD)

- **Outside Provider:** IBM
- **Product/Service:** Hardware maintenance
- **Capability to respond to needs:** Satisfactory

### Belton Police Department

- **Outsider Provider:** ITI  
**Product/Service:** Training, software upgrades and design consultation; Cass County 911 Emergency Dispatch  
**Capability to respond to needs:** Satisfactory
- **Outside Provider:** SPACES  
**Product/Service:** Provides maintenance to the hardware and networks  
**Capability to respond to needs:** Satisfactory

### Brookfield Police Department

- **Outside Provider:** Copeland Communication Corporation  
**Product/Service:** As needed design services, network and hardware support and/or maintenance.  
**Capability to respond to needs:** Satisfactory
- **Outside Provider:** ITI  
**Product/Service:** Law Enforcement System; Annual maintenance  
**Capability to respond to needs:** Satisfactory



- Outside Provider: Southwestern Bell  
Product/Service: 911 System  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Super Highway 36  
Product/Service: Intranet access; Email  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

#### Camden County Sheriff's Department

- Outside Provider: IBM  
Product/Service: MULES maintenance; software  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: ITI  
Product/Service: Application Support and Training  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

#### Greene County Sheriff's Department

- Outside Provider: DBI  
Product/Service: Maintenance of Livescan  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

#### Johnson County Sheriff's Department

- Outside Provider: ITI  
Product/Service: Software upgrades and maintenance of LES/RMS  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Central Communications  
Product/Service: Maintenance as needed hardware, network and design needs  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

#### Missouri State Highway Patrol

- Outside Provider: AmGRAF  
Product/Service: Forms development software & consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory



- Outside Provider: IBM  
Product/Service: Hardware, software & consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Information Builders  
Product/Service: Report development & data access software & consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: LogiSys- CAD  
Product/Service: Scheduler software and consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Mid States Crime Information Center (MOCIC)  
Product/Service: Security hardware, software and consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: PST  
Product/Service: Message switch hardware and software and consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Rose International/Confidus Group  
Product/Service: Consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Sagem MORPHO  
Product/Service: AFIS/GSP hardware, software, and consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Tier Technologies  
Product/Service: Consulting services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Verizon Wireless  
Product/Service: Wireless services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory



Pemiscot County Sheriff's Department

- Outside Provider: M & M Micro  
Product/Service: Sheriff's Office Management System (SOMS), software upgrades, training, implementation services and maintenance of software  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Cosmo Wireless  
Product/Service: Wireless services  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

Springfield Police Department

- Outside Provider: PCR  
Product/Service: Training software upgrades to CAD & maintenance  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Tiburon  
Product/Service: Training, software maintenance & software upgrades  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory



### **III. Study Findings: Prosecutors**

#### **Business Drivers**

Prosecutor participants identified the following Enablers, Inhibitors, and Critical Success Factors during the information gathering process:

#### **Enablers**

1. There are shared networks with other justice agencies.
2. There is access to computer applications of other agencies.
3. There are positive working relationships with other justice agencies.
4. There is a close geographical proximity of Prosecutors and Courts.

#### **Inhibitors**

1. Not all Prosecutors have access to automated prosecutor case information systems.
2. Applications are non-integrated. Law Enforcement, Jails, Prosecutors, Probation and Parole (P&P), and Courts enter duplicate information.
3. There is a lack of access to Court case application systems, particularly the Justice Information System (JIS).
4. Manual information sharing results in greater effort to share information.
5. There are inadequate staffing levels.
6. There is a lack of training in the use of application systems.
7. There is a lack of training in justice procedures. Justice personnel need to know and follow proper procedures.

#### **Critical Success Factors**

1. It is critical that all justice information be timely, complete, and accurate.
2. It is critical that application systems be integrated.

There was broad consensus among the study participants that the present situation, in which the vast majority of information exchanges are accomplished manually, greatly increases staff workloads and inhibits the effective sharing of information. The participants feel that integration of justice application systems and providing automated access to the appropriate justice information from external agencies would be extremely beneficial.



## **Appropriate and Hindering Constraints**

Two statutes were cited as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies.

### **Chapter 610 RSMo – Governmental Bodies and Records**

#### **§ 610.011 RSMo – Liberal construction of law to be public policy**

Generally referred to as the “Sunshine Law”, this section requires that meetings, records, votes, actions, and deliberations of public governmental bodies be open to the public unless otherwise provided by law.

**§43.503 RSMo** (Arrest, charge, and disposition of misdemeanors and felonies to be sent to highway patrol):

The Prosecutor of each county or the circuit attorney of a city not within a county shall notify the central repository on standard forms supplied by the highway patrol of all charges filed, including all those added subsequent to the filing of a criminal court case, and whether charges were not filed in criminal cases for which the central repository has a record of an arrest. All records forwarded to the central repository by Prosecutors or circuit attorneys as required by sections §43.500 to 43.530 RSMo shall include the state offense cycle number of the offense, and the originating agency identifier number of the reporting prosecutor, using such numbers as assigned by the highway patrol.

One agency’s interpretation of statutory or regulatory constraints was cited as inhibiting information sharing.

- Prosecutors reported that judges have latitude in determining whether to give them access to court information systems. Refusal to grant access by judges in certain jurisdictions inhibits the sharing of information.

In one jurisdiction, the Prosecutor was denied access since the Prosecutor’s Office was not considered to be a state agency. In another jurisdiction, the Prosecutor was granted access to the Court’s case management system.

## **Stakeholder Recommendations**

The Prosecutor study participants made a number of recommendations that centered primarily on information needed, but not currently received. Each recommendation, along with supporting comments, is documented in the following section of the report.

Recommendations are not attributed to the individual participant making the suggestion. Rather, they are presented as a consolidated listing of recommendations made by the seven Prosecutors’



offices that participated in the information gathering process. No attempt has been made to prioritize the recommendations.

1. Allow Prosecutors access to JIS.

Prosecutors need access to Associate and Circuit Court case information that is contained in JIS. There is often not enough staff for the large prosecution caseloads. There is too much paperwork; it gets backed-up and put in a box. A large effort is required to obtain Court information that could be retrieved electronically if the Prosecutors' Offices were on JIS.

2. Case information should be abstracted from JIS with a format and content similar to the information received from the Westlaw subscription service in order to support case research on Circuit Court cases.

The Westlaw subscription service only provides case information at the Appellate and Supreme Court levels.

3. Integrate prosecutor case management systems with JIS.

Prosecutors often have read-only access to Court information. There are virtually no automated exchanges of information between the Prosecutors and the Courts. The manual exchange of information via paper, phone, and fax is time consuming and inefficient. The same case-related information is often entered multiple times in different, non-integrated systems.

4. Use a common identifier for an incident that accompanies all subsequent documentation.

Incident documentation is often submitted to the Prosecutor prior to the arrest of a defendant. When the arrest occurs, the Prosecutor often is not notified, making it difficult to tie documentation together.

5. Implement a central repository for municipal offenses.

6. Municipal Prosecutors and Municipal Courts should be included on JIS.

7. Municipal case information should be included on Case.Net.

8. Fingerprinting of subjects should only occur at the booking agency in order to prevent duplicate OCNs.

In many cases, the arresting officer fingerprints the subject and then delivers the subject to jail, where subject is fingerprinted again. This can result in multiple OCNs for the same arrest.

9. Provide a more user-friendly interface for the MULES system and training to understand the content of MULES inquiry responses.





10. Law Enforcement should submit information to Prosecutors electronically.

Information is presently received manually. Sometimes the Prosecutor's staff must drive to the Law Enforcement agency to pick up the documentation. Information is then keyed in from Law Enforcement documents. This results in duplicate entry and duplicate paper record storage. Not receiving records electronically means manual files can be at one of many different locations prior to entry.

11. Modify existing systems or implement a new system that provides for electronic exchange of information between county jails, MDOC facilities, and Prosecutors' offices.

This would eliminate the need for numerous phone calls to obtain the information.

12. Issue blocks of court case numbers to the Prosecutors' offices.

Some Courts don't issue case numbers after 3 p.m. This wastes Prosecutor staff time and limits Law Enforcement access to the Prosecutor for the purpose of filing cases from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m.

13. Allow secondary dissemination of information if the requesting agency has the authority to directly access the information.

The prohibition on secondary dissemination of information introduces extra effort into the information gathering process. Two agencies with authority to directly access information should be able to share that same information.

14. Increase dissemination of Violent and Sexual Predator Information by changing statutory limitations.

15. Criminal history information should be made more accurate and up to date by the enforcement of the statute on arrest and disposition reporting (§43.503 RSMo).

Complete and accurate arrest and disposition information is not being reported to the central repository in a timely fashion.

16. Provide funding so Prosecutors desiring access to REJIS and ALERT can be provided access.

17. Municipal Prosecutors should receive training on statutory requirements regarding the submission of fingerprint cards to the CHRS.

Not all Municipal Prosecutors have a clear understanding of which printable offenses are reportable.

18. Prosecutors should receive a copy of all completed search warrants. The statutory requirement should be enforced.

19. Prosecutors request that the Courts provide them with copies of probation violation hearing notices and probation violation reports.

Prosecutors are not always informed of the date of a violation hearing, which sometimes results in them not being present for the hearings. It is important that Prosecutors have an opportunity to provide input at the hearings.



20. For county jails, a system/process should be developed to readily identify whether an individual detained on a 20-hour hold is being held on state or municipal charges. This will allow the appropriate Prosecutor to be notified.

In some cases, the Municipal Prosecutor is called on all 20-hour holds. Researching the individual scenarios to determine if the individual is held on state or municipal charges is time consuming. If the Municipal Prosecutor is notified with little of the 20 hours remaining, and the individual being held on state charges, this may result in the individual being released before a warrant can be obtained.

21. Technology available to Prosecutors should be upgraded to keep up with the technology used to gather evidence. Two examples were given:
- a. A victim of harassment recorded the suspect on an MP3 player and gave the tape to Law Enforcement, who copied it to a compact disk (CD). When attempting to play the CD for the Court, it was realized that the tape did not copy well.
  - b. Security cameras are no longer routinely recorded on VHS tapes. Often, they are recording on disk or in a digital image format. Not all Prosecutors have the technology to review evidence recorded on these new media.
22. For a Trial De Novo, all disposition data from Circuit Courts should be entered in the municipal case system.

23. Provide an automated notification for Prosecutors when court dates change.

24. Prosecutors should receive automated notification when a defendant is given a court date after being arrested on a warrant.

Many times, the Prosecutors are not notified of warrant arrests. The arresting agency gives the defendant a court date and fails to notify the Prosecutor. The defendant then appears in Court and the Prosecutor, not knowing the case was scheduled, is not prepared.

25. Prosecutors should receive electronic notification of warrant information, bond amounts, and copies of search warrants.

Large caseloads and small staffs make obtaining this information difficult.

26. Law Enforcement should always provide an OCN when submitting documentation for a charging decision.

This will save the Prosecutors time and eliminate the confusion associated with attaching the OCN to the case later (and sometimes this never occurs, which impacts disposition reporting to the CHRS).

27. Formalize the process of submitting cases to the Prosecutor by Law Enforcement, and the process by which the Prosecutor informs the Law Enforcement of acceptance or refusal of cases.

Formalizing the process would make it more clear what information was submitted to the Prosecutors and document the reasons for the Prosecutors' actions taken (or not taken).



28. Prosecutors request that the Courts forward copies of all motions filed by defense attorneys to the Prosecutors.

Presently, some defense attorneys file motions directly with the Court and often fail to provide copies to the Prosecutors. This lack of information inhibits the effective management of Prosecutors' cases.

29. Law Enforcement should submit Fingerprint Card Disposition Sheets and files to Prosecutors at the same time. This will help to ensure that the appropriate information is sent to the appropriate Prosecutor level.

Files and fingerprint cards are often not submitted at the same time. This results in officers submitting stacks of Fingerprint Card Disposition Sheets for both municipal and state offenses, causing additional work for the municipal Prosecutor's office.

### **Technology Assessment**

The technology available to the Prosecutor study participants varies widely, from an office with a single PC with word processing capability and no Internet access to offices with networked PCs that have access to multiple application systems.

All of the Prosecutors have office productivity software such as word processors and spreadsheets. Most have Internet access and e-mail capability. Approximately half of the Prosecutors have automated Prosecutor Case Management systems. However, no two participating offices use the same Prosecutor Case Management system.

None of the Prosecutor Case Management systems are integrated with Court Case Management systems. Many (five of seven) of the Prosecutors have inquiry access to Court Case Management systems for their Courts. This is useful for viewing case related information, but the lack of integrated systems results in duplicate entry of information and information exchanges that are paper, fax, and phone call based.

There is little automated access available to Law Enforcement, MDOC, Jails, and P&P application systems. Information gathered from these sources is predominantly manual.

In addition to the extra workload associated with the manual exchanges of information with external justice agencies, significant effort is expended in preparing documents for Courts. Due to the Courts often being overwhelmed with paperwork, most Prosecutors have adopted the business practice of preparing a number of forms for the Courts. An example is the application process for search warrants. The Prosecutors submit the applications to the Courts and, if approved, the Courts issue the search warrants. However, most Prosecutors fill out both the applications and the warrants, so that all the judge has to do is sign the warrants.

Very few technical services and software applications are supplied by outside providers. Some offices have access to REJIS, ALERT, and MULES. Several have subscription services with



Westlaw to obtain case law information. One office purchased a system for tracking bad checks from a small local firm and one office uses the Prosecutor Dialog System from Graphic Computer Solutions.

The Prosecutors generally do not have technical staff to implement and support application systems. Some of the offices have access to the Court's technical staff or city government staff for technical support.

In summary, approximately half of the Prosecutor study participants have an automated system for managing Prosecutor cases. None of these systems are fully integrated with the Courts. There is no standard Prosecutor Case Management system in use, although the Prosecutor Dialog System is coming into wider use and has been identified by the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services as the system that should be used. The manual exchange of information increases the workload in the Prosecutors' Offices, especially for those offices that do not have inquiry access into Courts' Case Management systems.

There is room for significant improvement in the use of technology in the Prosecutors' Offices. The most pressing need is for Prosecutor Case Management systems to be integrated with Court Case Management systems. Receiving Law Enforcement information electronically rather than via paper forms would reduce the workload associated with re-entering information into the prosecutor systems.

### **Interagency Agreements**

The interagency agreements regarding integration and information exchange that were identified by Prosecutor study participants during the information gathering process are listed below:

- Memorandum of Understanding with MSHP for MULES.
- The St. Louis County Circuit Clerk is responsible for disposition reporting to the State Repository maintained by MSHP, but the St. Louis County Prosecutor's Office reports the dispositions for the Circuit Clerk.
- Memorandum of Understanding regarding the use of the ALERT.

### **Existing Justice Information Systems**

Listed below are the Justice Information Systems used by each Prosecutor study participant, with a description of those systems:

#### Attorney General's Office

- Case Docketing: This provides scheduling and case management functions.



#### Clay County Prosecutor

- 7<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court System: This provides case management functionality. Prosecutor's staff have read-only access, with the ability to add scanned documents as attachments to case files.

#### Columbia Prosecutor

- Case.Net: Provides access to Circuit Court case information. Case.Net provides only information deemed to be public, and includes only information for those for Courts that have implemented the JIS.
- HFS Docket System (HFS Software, Inc.): The Columbia Municipal Court docketing system provides scheduling and case management functions.
- Prosecutor Case Spreadsheet: This is a Corel Quattro Pro spreadsheet used to track Prosecutor cases.
- Westlaw: This is a subscription service that provides case information from the Appellate and Supreme Court levels.

#### Kansas City Prosecutor

- ALERT: Supports inquiries on persons, vehicles, guns and other valuable articles.

#### Lawrence County Prosecutor

- Bad Check System: This system tracks bad checks.
- MULES: Provides criminal history, warrants, stolen vehicle information, etc. and NLETS and NCIC queries.
- Prosecutor Dialog System: This is a Prosecutor Case Management system.

#### Mt. Vernon Prosecutor

- The Mt. Vernon Prosecutor's Office does not have a computer system; therefore, no justice information systems.

#### St. Louis County Prosecutor

- Case Information System: This product is provided by REJIS. It is written in Clarion, and provides Prosecutor case information.
- REJIS: This system provides access to Eastern region information, the Criminal History Records System (CHRS), and MULES/NCIC/NLETS.
- Westlaw: This is a subscription service that provides case information from the Appellate and Supreme Court levels.



## **Mode Of Information Exchanges**

The mode (manual vs. automated) of Prosecutor information exchanges with external justice agencies is predominantly manual. Information sent from Prosecutors to Law Enforcement, Courts, County Jails, MDOC, and P&P is communicated via paper or phone calls.

The only automated exchanges identified were responses received to inquiries into computer applications such as the MULES, REJIS, ALERT, JIS, and several Court systems developed in-house.

## **Justice Agency Environment and Technical Skills**

Listed below are the technical environments and description of staff technical skills for each Prosecutor study participant:

### Attorney General's Office

- **Technical environment:** The Attorney General's Office uses WordPerfect 9 for word processing, Microsoft Excel and Access for spreadsheets and special database applications, and uses Netware as the networking environment for file and print sharing. GroupWise is used as the office e-mail system. The Attorney General's Office has nine locations connected to the LAN via 384k frame relay circuits. An AS/400 is used for case tracking. The Attorney General's Office is currently converting from a Token Ring environment to Ethernet.
- **Technical skills:** The Information Systems staff consists of two hardware technicians that set up and support all hardware and software in the Attorney General's Office. They also provide Internet support. One help desk person fields all front line questions and refers problems to the appropriate person to troubleshoot, and is also responsible for phone communications. One network administrator handles servers, routers, switches, and office e-mail setup and support. The Attorney General's Office currently outsources all programming. The Information Systems Manager oversees day-to-day operations for all computer needs of the office, as well as project management and workflow for technical needs.

### Clay County Prosecutor

- **Technical environment:** The Clay County Prosecutor's Office uses Microsoft Office 2000 Professional. Windows 2000 is the operating system on the office's personal computers. The technical environment includes CISCO routers and Compaq servers. The Prosecutor's office uses the same network as the Clay County Circuit Court. They are in the process of scanning all case files in order to maintain electronic files, with the old paper files being shredded. Access to all systems is controlled using Proximity Smart Cards for login access.



- Technical skills: All programming, network administration, software installation, etc., for the Clay County Prosecutor's Office is handled by Justice Information Services (part of the Court). Justice Information Services has 9 data processing staff, consisting of 1 director with programming capabilities, 3 network staff, 1 web programmer, 2 programmers, 1 project manager, and 1 help desk staff.

#### Columbia Prosecutor

- Technical environment: The Columbia Prosecutor's Office has Internet access to Case.Net, City Ordinances, Missouri State Statutes, Case Law, Westlaw, and general investigation services. A process is in place to network the Columbia Prosecutor's Office to the City of Columbia government network, which will include a fiber optic connection to the Boone County Jail. The Prosecutor's Office uses PCs, but the machines are not equipped adequately with newer technology such as CD-ROM drives. The Office has Internet access. Prosecutors can e-mail Columbia Police officers at the officers' desktop workstations or workstations in police vehicles.
- Technical skills: All programming, network administration, software installation, etc., for the Columbia Prosecutor's office is handled by the City of Columbia government IT department.

#### Kansas City Prosecutor

- Technical environment: The Kansas City Prosecutor's Office uses personal computers to access (read-only) the ALERT system. Computer stations also are accessible in the courtroom for access to ALERT and to the Municipal Court. The Kansas City Prosecutor's Office uses Word Perfect and Word for word processing, Microsoft Excel for spreadsheets, and Outlook for e-mail.
- Technical skills: All program Office is handled by the Kansas City government IT department.

#### Lawrence County Prosecutor

- Technical environment: The Lawrence County Prosecutor's Office uses a Compaq Proliant 800 server, with staff networked on Compaq personal computers. Staff uses the Microsoft Office 2000 Suite and Windows 95 Operating System. MULES access is via a modem. The agency is connected via fiber optic cable to the Lawrence County Sheriff's Department. This connection provides the Prosecutor's office Internet access capability. The Lawrence County Circuit Court (which resides in the same physical facility) is on JIS, but the Lawrence County Prosecutor's Office is not allowed access because they "are not considered a state agency".
- Technical skills: The Lawrence County Prosecutor's Office staff has the technical skills to operate the systems currently in place. When technical problems occur, assistance is requested from the Lawrence County Sheriff's Department, MSHP, or the software vendor.





#### Mt. Vernon Prosecutor

- Technical environment: The Mt. Vernon Prosecutor's Office does not have a computer system; therefore, no Internet or email. The Prosecutor does not feel the need to be automated, although he said it would be beneficial. He obtains any needed information from the Police Chief, county Prosecutor, or the dispatcher at the jail. The secretary does have a personal computer and uses the Microsoft Office product suite. Records of cases are maintained manually using a file card system.
- Technical skills: The Mt. Vernon Prosecutor's Office staff does not have technical skills for programming, network administration, software installation, etc.

#### St. Louis County Prosecutor:

- Technical environment: The St. Louis County Prosecutor's Office technical environment consists of personal computers that are Pentium 2's and 3's. They are a part of the "St. Louis Campus" network. Operating systems include Win95 and some Win98, with plans to upgrade to XP this fall. Internet access is provided by REJIS via a T1 line. The agency uses the Microsoft Office Suite and Outlook for e-mail.
- Technical skills: The St. Louis County Prosecutor's Office has an Information Systems Coordinator/Network Administrator who serves as a liaison to REJIS.

#### **Outside Providers**

Listed below are the outside providers of software, products/service provided for each Prosecutor study participant, and each provider's capability to respond to needs. In addition, some of the Prosecutors participating in the study use JIS "read only" and MULES. OSCA and MSHP administer these systems respectively.

#### Attorney General's Office

- Outside Provider: REJIS (Regional Justice Information System)  
Product/Service: Provides access to Eastern region information. Accessed over the Internet via MOBarNet.  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Westlaw  
Product/Service: Westlaw subscription service for case law research. Provides case information from the Appellate and Court levels.  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

#### Clay County Prosecutor's Office

- None



Columbia Prosecutor

- Outside Provider: Westlaw  
Product/Service: Westlaw subscription service for case law research. Provides case information from the Appellate and Supreme Court levels.  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

Kansas City Prosecutor

- None

Lawrence County Prosecutor

- Outside Provider: Dennis Jones & Associates, Lebanon, MO  
Product/Service: Software package to manage bad checks. County Prosecutor pays a maintenance fee for new releases and basic support.  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: Prosecutor Dialog System  
Product/Service: From Graphic Computer Solutions. Prosecutor case management functionality. Pay maintenance for new releases and basic support.  
Capability to respond to needs: Do not receive the level of support desired.

Mt. Vernon Prosecutor

- None

St. Louis County Prosecutor

- Outside Provider: Westlaw  
Product/Service: Westlaw subscription service for case law research. Provides case information from the Appellate and Supreme Court levels.  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory



## **IV. Study Findings: Courts**

### **Business Drivers**

The Courts study participants identified the following Enablers, Inhibitors, and Critical Success Factors were identified during the information gathering process:

#### **Enablers**

1. Courts utilize computer systems to store justice information.
2. Courts have e-mail access.
3. Courts have Internet access.
4. Courts access external systems (ALERT, MULES, REJIS, etc.).
5. Courts utilize a network.
6. Courts employ IT staff.
7. Courts have existing interfaces with other agencies.
8. Courts grant web access to public records.
9. Courts have staff with technical skill sets that will facilitate the development and implementation of data exchanges.
10. Courts (2 of 6) are upgrading their systems to newer technology or software that will help implement new data exchanges.
11. Systems such as ALERT and REJIS enhance the information sharing capabilities of the agencies having access to those systems.

#### **Inhibitors**

1. Some information is not received at all.
2. Information that is received is untimely, incomplete and/or inaccurate.
3. Systems are not integrated.
4. Business processes are not consistent.
5. Business processes are not consistently followed.

#### **Critical Success Factors**

1. It is critical that application systems be integrated.
2. It is critical that all justice information be timely, complete, and accurate – from both a sending and receiving perspective.
3. Funding is critical.

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



4. Training is critical.
5. Business procedures need to be reviewed, revised, and enforced.
6. Existing state statutes need to be reviewed.

### **Appropriate and Hindering Constraints**

The following statutes were identified as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies.

#### **Chapter 221 RSMo Jails and Jailers**

##### **§ 221.510 RSMo- Pending outstanding warrants in MULES and NCIC systems, inquiry conducted, when (Jakes Law)**

This section requires Law Enforcement officials, jailers, and MDOC to conduct checks for outstanding warrants in MULES and NCIC before an inmate is released from custody.

#### **Chapter 302 RSMo Drivers' and Commercial Drivers' Licenses**

##### **§ 302.225 RSMo Surrender of license--record of convictions, kept where, by whom -- revocation by city officials prohibited.**

This section discusses the reporting dispositions of reportable offenses and point violations to the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MULES).

#### **Chapter 577 RSMo – Public Safety Offenses**

##### **§ 577.051 RSMo – Missouri uniform law enforcement system records, information entered by the highway patrol, when, made available, to whom—failure to furnish records to patrol, penalty—forms and procedures for filing records**

This section governs final dispositions for Driving Under the Influence (DUI), the record information entered by MSHP or the Department of Revenue (DOR) into the MULES, when they are to be entered, what can be made available, to whom, and penalties for failure to furnish records to the MSHP.



### **Chapter 559 RSMo Probation**

#### **§ 559.125 RSMo Record of applications for probation or parole to be kept --information to be privileged--exceptions.**

This section requires the clerk of the Court to keep in a permanent file all applications for probation or parole, Pre-Sentence Investigations, probations or paroles granted, revoked or terminated, and all discharges from probations or paroles. It further states that information and data obtained by a P&P Officer shall be privileged information and shall not be receivable in any court. Such information shall not be disclosed directly or indirectly to anyone other than the members of a Parole Board and the judge entitled to receive reports, except the court or the Board may in its discretion permit the inspection of the report, or parts of such report, by the defendant, or offender or his attorney, or other person having a proper interest therein.

### **Chapter 610 RSMo – Governmental Bodies and Records**

#### **§ 610.011 RSMO – Liberal construction of law to be public policy**

Generally referred to as the “Sunshine Law”, this section requires that meetings, records, votes, actions, and deliberations of public governmental bodies be open to the public unless otherwise provided by law.

The following Court Rules were identified as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies.

**Court Operating Rule 1** prohibits the court from having a link to the Sheriffs’ Offices.

**Court Operating Rule 2** establishes public access to records of the judicial department.

**Supreme Court Rules for Municipal Courts 37.68** discusses the Municipal Courts’ record retention policies.

**Supreme Court Rule 43.01** discusses faxing and digitally filing Court documents. The rule allows for faxing and digital filing, but requires the original to be filed within 3 business days.

The following is a list of statutes/rules/policies referred to during the interview process, but insufficient information was provided by the Courts classify the items as enablers or inhibitors.

1. Supreme Court Rule that make the Circuit Courts responsible for Bond Schedules.
2. §559 RSMO that allows a defendant to be automatically released unless a hearing date is set.
3. State Statute requiring that charges be filed within 30 days, after that it is a closed record and must be reported to the state as ‘charges not filed’.
4. State Statute that requires the quote “swear on oath” on certain documents. There is a document that is produced by MDOC that has all the information except this quote.



Therefore, there must be a second document created by the Court that includes the quote required by statute.

5. Rule that warrants may not be entered into MULES or NCIC without Central Dispatch receiving a signed copy of the warrant with the Court's seal.

The following technological issues were identified as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies.

1. Courts utilize different software packages to store justice information.
2. Courts store their data in different databases or file systems.
3. Courts have different hardware platforms.
4. None of the Courts are setup for electronic filing; however, several Courts noted electronic filing as a long-term objective

A common problem for the Courts is that many external agencies do not possess the technical capabilities to engage in electronic information sharing (i.e., the external agencies do not have computer systems, Internet access, e-mail, etc.).

### **Stakeholder Recommendations**

The Courts study participants made a number of recommendations. The recommendations centered primarily on information needed by the Courts, but is not currently received, received in an untimely manner or received with inaccuracies. Each recommendation, along with supporting comments, is documented in the following section of the report. Recommendations are not attributed to the individual participant making the suggestion. Rather, they are presented as a consolidated listing of recommendations made by the participants during the information gathering process. No attempt has been made to prioritize the recommendations.

1. Provide Municipal Courts access to financial information for cases transferred to Circuit Court.

Municipal Courts would like to see financial information about cases that were transferred to Circuit Court. Financial data is currently stored on a system that is not available to other agencies.

2. Provide Municipal Courts access to confidential records.

Currently, the Municipal Courts have access to St. Louis County Courts' data through the REJIS system. However, Chapter 610 RSMo restricts the agencies that are allowed to view confidential records.

3. The Municipal Courts would like to interface with Law Enforcement so that tickets may be filed electronically. Currently, paper copies of the tickets are filed.



4. Place MULES terminals within the Municipal Courts. If staff is certified to use MULES, then certification must occur. Additional funding may also be necessary.

Information about an individual's criminal history is not received/not accessible from other Courts. Such information includes for example: arrest data, state charges and concoctions.

5. Modify Municipal Courts' retention of records policy (Supreme Court Rules for Municipal Courts 37.68) to be consistent with the rules applied to Circuit Courts.

County Prosecutors enhance a Driving While Suspended charge to a felony using prior convictions. The state only requires Municipal Courts to retain a copy of the disposition for these cases for three years and can be destroyed after this time.

6. Provide Municipal Courts with disposition information on cases that were sent to Circuit Courts as a result of a request for Jury Trial or a Municipal cases being appealed, the Circuit Courts do not send the final disposition of the case back to Municipal Courts

7. Circuit Courts would like to send Electronic Monitoring Lists electronically to local Law Enforcement.

If they do not have this info some people may be released from the electronic monitoring devices.

8. Provide Circuit Courts with Jury Trial Requests and Municipal Appeals electronically.

Currently these cases are transferred to Circuit Court manually. Creating an electronic exchange of this information would greatly reduce the amount of time spent by the Courts' staff, which manually enters the case information into their Case Management system.

9. Provide the ability for Circuit Courts to communicate Sentence & Judgment information to Jail, MDOC, and P&P in a timelier manner.

10. Provide the ability for Circuit Courts to communicate in a timelier manner to Law Enforcement and Prosecutors when warrants are issued, lists of outstanding warrants, and when warrants are recalled.

Courts would like to give this information electronically so that it would be timely.

11. Circuit Court would like to provide Sheriffs with information on when Summons are issued and served.

Courts would like to provide this information electronically so that it would be timely. Statutory restriction for actual/electronic signatures exist that may hinder this.

12. Electronically provide information when bonds are posted and the amount of the bond.

The date on which a defendant posts bond is not received in a timely manner. The amount of the bond posted by the defendant is not being received in a timely manner.





13. Develop a procedure for submitting jail time completion information to the Courts on a regular basis.

This is a timeliness issue for the Courts; often the Courts must contact the jails for this information.

14. Courts would like to receive program completion/failure information from MDOC electronically.

15. Court would like to electronically transfer Court notes and/or docket sheets to MDOC.

When an incarcerated defendant is brought to Court for a hearing etc., MDOC requires Court notes or a copy of the docket sheet reflecting the Court action when the defendant is returned. Ideally, this exchange could be done much more efficiently through the electronic transfer of information.

16. Need to develop electronic notification of hearing dates for Law Enforcement Officers and Prosecutors, such as interfaces or email.

The dates for future Court events are not being received in a timely manner or are not received at all by the Jails, Law Enforcement and other Courts.

This is mainly requested for traffic cases, but could also be beneficial in criminal cases. Court calendars are not currently sent electronically to Law Enforcement or Prosecutors. Hearing calendars are available in JIS; however, the Law Enforcement and Prosecutor systems are not compatible with JIS, and no interface has been developed.

17. Provide Courts with Parole and Flat Time release dates.

It would be helpful to the sentencing Courts to receive Parole release dates or Flat Time release dates. The release date information would also be useful with regard to juvenile offenders serving time in the Department of Youth Services.

18. Courts would like to receive daily jail population lists electronically.

Information about who is currently in custody is not being received in a timely manner. Electronic notification would allow Courts to monitor those in custody and the length of time in custody. Additionally, it would be helpful to know when offenders are in custody for Probation Warrants.

19. The Courts wants a central repository of Municipal Courts' dispositions to be maintained and available to the Courts and Law Enforcement. This repository could be similar to the CHRS.

Disposition information from other counties and other Courts is not being received in a timely manner.

20. Develop an interface between Courts and local Law Enforcement agencies to provide electronic information regarding case dispositions.



21. Allow Courts to enter warrant information into MULES.

Currently, the Courts send a hard copy of their warrants to the Sheriffs' Departments where the warrant information is then entered into MULES. Law Enforcement Officers need warrant information immediately, as they may have contact with an individual and not be aware that a warrant is active, if it is not in MULES. Also, in some of the larger jurisdictions, a backlog may occur due to the volume of criminal and traffic warrants issued.

22. Amend the statute to allow sentence and judgment information to be sent from the Courts to MDOC electronically.

Currently, if an inmate in MDOC is sentenced on pending charges, upon final disposition, the sentence and judgment information is sent by certified mail per state statute.

23. Set procedures for who should create the OCN.

There is no statewide policy on out of county warrants being served with regard to which agency/jurisdiction is responsible for creating the OCN.

24. Simplify the OCN form by reducing the amount of required information and reducing the amount of carbon copies. Providing electronic means to capture fingerprints may lessen this issue; however, current electronic fingerprinting systems cost approximately \$50,000. With budget constraints, few agencies can obtain these systems.

The Courts are not consistently receiving the OCN from Prosecutors, in part because the OCN is not being passed from Law Enforcement to them. Law Enforcement must manually type these forms due to the number of carbon copies that need to be made. The amount of required information contributes to the incompleteness of the forms.

25. Develop the ability to electronically submit the Probation Warrants to both the Courts and local Law Enforcement.

When Probation Warrants are issued, and when individuals are picked up on those warrants, information is not being received at all or is not received in a timely manner.

26. Create a rule or statute detailing procedures for distribution of Probation Warrants.

The Circuit Courts would like to consistently receive copies of warrants issued by the state probation office.

27. Create a website where Courts could obtain information about outstanding/pending warrants.

Information on outstanding/pending warrants from other counties/Courts within the state as well as information about when a warrant has been served is not received at all, is inaccessible, or is received in an untimely manner.

28. Review the policies and procedures for clearing warrants.

Jake's Law requires an NCIC and MULES check for outstanding warrants before releasing a defendant. If warrants for jurisdictions having holds on the defendants were not cleared, the execution of Jake's Law would prevent release of that individual.



When an individual has outstanding warrants in multiple jurisdictions and that individual is arrested, Law Enforcement agencies record that the individual was arrested, and all outstanding warrants that exist in MULES and NCIC are cleared. The fact that other warrants exist for the individual is not communicated to the arresting county or to other counties. Before an individual is released from custody, Law Enforcement is required to check for outstanding warrants. Because all of the outstanding warrants that existed for the individual were cleared when the individual was arrested, no outstanding warrants will appear, and the individual will be released.

29. Prosecutors need recommendations on bond investigations in a timelier manner from the Courts.

30. Provide Prosecutors electronic access to disposition information.

Prosecutors would like access to all case dispositions, some of which may not be viewable to the public and therefore not accessible via CaseNet.

31. Automatically generate lists from the Prosecutors' and the Courts' systems to be used as checks and balances to monitor expiring cases.

One Court reported that they are not receiving information from the Prosecutor's Office about why there is no action on Uniform Disposition Detainer cases.

32. MDOC needs to develop strict procedures and require standardized forms with regard to filings of Uniform Disposition Detainers.

MDOC currently allows Uniform Disposition Detainers to be filed by any inmate, and does not restrict filing procedures. §217.450 RSMo only requires the request to be in writing, but does not specify procedures or a document for filing such request.

33. Work with the MDOC to develop a consistent practice or written procedure detailing the necessary requirements for completing the sentence and judgment form.

There are times when MDOC refuses to accept a defendant into the institution because of the sentence and judgment form has not been completed properly. As a result, the subject is returned to the county jail until the necessary changes are made to the sentence and judgment form.

34. MDOC should provide a list of available program options and openings to the Courts prior to case dispositions.

Information about the availability of diversion programs or programs within a detention facility is not being received in a timely manner.

35. Provide MSHP access to REJIS to view case disposition information.

When one Court sends dispositions to the CHRS, there is no matching case filing; therefore, the disposition is rejected. Later, when the Prosecutor submits the filing to the CHRS, it is lacking a disposition. MSHP then requests the disposition from the Court, and the Court then re-submits the disposition.



## Technology Assessment

The table below provides a synopsis of the technology questionnaire results. (Note: A technology assessment of the Judicial Records Committee was not done because the JRC is an advisory committee to the Courts, but does not process cases like the other courts interviewed.)

Technical Information	Boone County	Branson	Henry County	Kansas City	St. Louis County	Springfield
Internal System	X	X	X	X	X	X
Vendor Supplied	X	X	X		X	X
Networked	X	X	X	X		X
IT Staff	X			X	X	X
End Users	125	5	19	70	N/A	22
Workstations	125	5	19	70	N/A	8
Programming	X			X	X	X
System Administrator	X				X	X
Database Administrator	X				X	X
General	X			X	X	X
Internet Access	X	X	X	X	X	X
E-mail	X	X	X	X	X	X
Web access for public records	X	X	X	X		
Electronic Filing						
External System Access	X	X	X	X	X	X
Interface w/ other systems	X			X	X	X
Software/Consulting Providers	X	X	X		X	

The Courts have the following technologies that enable the exchange of data between agencies:

1. All of the Courts utilize computer systems to store justice information.
2. All of the Courts have e-mail access.
3. All of the Courts have Internet access.
4. All of the Courts access external systems - (e.g., ALERT, MULES, REJIS, etc.).
5. Most Courts (5 of 6) utilize a network.

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



6. Most Courts (4 of 6) employ an IT staff.
7. Most of the Courts (4 of 6) have existing interfaces with other agencies.
8. Most of the Courts (4 of 6) grant web access to public records.
9. Most of the Courts (4 of 6) have staff with technical skill sets that will facilitate the development and implementation of data exchanges.
10. Some of the Courts (2 of 6) are upgrading their systems to newer technology or software that will help implement new data exchanges.

(Note: Systems such as ALERT and REJIS enhance the information sharing capabilities of the agencies involved in those agreements.)

The Courts have the following technologies that may inhibit the exchange of data between agencies:

1. Most of the Courts employ different software packages to store justice information (5 of 6).
2. Most of the Courts store their data in different databases or file systems (5 of 6).
3. Most of the Courts have different hardware platforms (4 of 6).
4. None of the Courts are setup for electronic filing. However, several Courts noted electronic filing as a long-term objective (4 of 6).

(Note: A common problem for the Courts is that many external agencies do not possess the technical capabilities to engage in electronic information sharing (i.e., the external agencies do not have computer systems, Internet access, e-mail, etc.)

### **Interagency Agreements**

Following is a list of interagency agreements discovered during the study:

- There is an interagency agreement between the Courts and the MSHP regarding the new Driving While Intoxicated Tracking System. This system is designed to house DWI offender information from both the state and municipal Courts. DWI disposition information from the Circuit Courts will be downloaded from the JIS to the MSHP system and via Statewide Judicial Information System (SWJIS) reporting downloads for those state Courts that are not on the JIS. The Municipal Courts anticipate entering DWI disposition data using a web interface. The system is expected to be fully operational by July 2004. The state Courts recognize policies will need to be established with MSHP to define the rules regarding the electronic transfer of the JIS information.
- The Springfield Municipal Court has an Access Agreement with the Springfield Police Department and E911. This agreement allows the ability to view final dispositions and check active warrants in the Municipal Courts computer system. The supervisor at the police department and the Court computer analyst must approve the employees given access to the information. The computer analyst monitors usage and controls level of security for inquiries.



of the Court information. Everyone granted access to the Court information is held to a shared confidentiality agreement.

- St. Louis County uses REJIS to share data with other agencies. St. Louis County has this type of agreement with the following agencies: Law Enforcement, Justice Services (Jail), Prosecutors and the Municipal Courts. Currently, St. Louis County and MSHP are working on a similar data access agreement.
- Kansas City uses ALERT to share data with other agencies. ALERT is maintained by KCPD. KCPD facilitates the interchange of criminal justice information between the Courts and other computerized systems including MULES, NCIC, and NLETS, Department of Revenue (DOR) and Kansas Department of Revenue (KDOR).

### **Existing Justice Information Systems**

Listed below are the Justice Information Systems used by each Court study participant, with a description of those systems. (Note: A technology assessment of the Judicial Records Committee was not done because the JRC is an advisory committee to the Courts, but does not process cases like the other Courts interviewed.)

#### Boone County Circuit Court

- ACS Justice Information System: Case Management

#### Branson Municipal Court

- Autocite: Parking System
- HTE: Case Management System

#### Henry County Circuit Court

- ACS Justice Information System: Case Management System

#### Kansas City Municipal Court

- Automated Law Enforcement Response Team (ALERT): Law Enforcement/Case Management System

#### Springfield Municipal Court

- Court Clerk: Case Management System

#### St. Louis County Circuit Court

- CMS Criminal: Case Management System
- Criminal Taxing: Criminal Taxing System
- SPS Garnishment/Restitution: Garnishment/Restitution System

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



## **Mode Of Information Exchanges**

The mode (manual vs. automated) of the Municipal and Circuit Court Information Exchanges with external justice agencies is predominantly manual. Information sent from the Courts to the Prosecutors, Law Enforcement, MDOC, County Jails, and P&P is communicated via paper, fax, and phone. The only automated exchanges identified were with the MULES and inquiry of the court case information via Case.Net.

## **Courts Technical Environment and Technical Skills**

Listed below are the technical environments and description of agency technical skills for each Court study participant. (Note: A technology assessment of the Judicial Records Committee was not done because the JRC is an advisory committee to the Courts, but does not process cases like the other Courts interviewed.)

### Boone County Circuit Court

- Technical environment: Uses both internal and vendor supplied systems; is networked; has IT staff, with 125 workstation, and 125 end users; Internet Access, E-mail; and Web access for public records.
- Technical Skills: Programming: Access, Visual Basic, C++ and Delphi.  
System Administration: Windows NT/2000/XP.  
Database Administration: SQL Server.  
General: Networking, Software Installation and Support.

### Branson Municipal Court

- Technical environment: Uses both internal and vendor supplied systems; is networked; has no IT staff; 5 workstations and 5 end users; Internet Access; E-mail; and Web access for public records.
- Technical Skills: None.

### Henry County Circuit Court

- Technical environment: Uses both internal and vendor supplied systems; is networked; has no IT staff; 19 workstations with 19 end users; Internet access; E-mail; and Web access for public records.
- Technical Skills: None.





#### Kansas City Municipal Court

- Technical environment: Uses internal system; is networked; has IT staff; 70 workstations with 70 end users; Internet access; E-mail; Web access for public records.
- Technical Skills: Programming: Cobol IMS  
General: Software Installation and Support

#### Springfield Municipal Court

- Technical environment: Uses both internal and vendor supplied systems; is networked; has IT staff; 8 workstations with 22 end users; Internet access; E-mail.
- Technical Skills: Programming: Oracle Forms and IBM RPG IV  
System Administration: Windows NT/2000/XP and IBM AS400  
Database Administration: IBM DB2/400  
General: Web Services, Internet Security and Support.

#### St. Louis County Circuit Court

- Technical environment: Uses both internal and vendor supplied systems; has IT staff; Internet access; E-mail.
- Technical Skills: System Administration: Windows NT/2000/XP and NOVELL

#### **Outside Providers**

Listed below are the outside providers of software, products/service provided for each Court study participant, and each provider's capability to respond to needs. (Note: A technology assessment of the Judicial Records Committee was not done because the JRC is an advisory committee to the Courts, but does not process cases like the other Courts interviewed.)

#### Boone County Circuit Court

- Outside Provider: ACS  
Product/Service: Provides Software and Support (Justice Information System)  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

#### Branson Municipal Court

- Outside Provider: Autocite  
Product/Service: Provides Software (Autocite Parking system)  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory
- Outside Provider: HTE/Sungard  
Product/Service: Provides Software (HTE version 6.1 Courts software program)  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory  
Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



Henry County Circuit Court

- Outside Provider: ACS  
Product/Service: Provides Software and Support (Justice Information System)  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

Kansas City Municipal Court

- Outside Provider: Kansas City, Missouri Police Department  
Product/Service: Provides software and support (ALERT)  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory

St. Louis County Circuit Court

- Outsider Provider: REJIS  
Product/Service: Provides software and Support (CMS Civil, CMS Criminal, SPS – Garnishment and Restitution, Criminal Taxing and Sentence and Judgment)  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory



## **V. Study Findings: MDOC – Incarceration**

### **Business Drivers**

MDOC Incarceration study participants identified the following Enablers, Inhibitors, and Critical Success Factors during the information gathering process:

#### **Enablers**

1. Access to MULES;
2. OPII capabilities and comprehensive data;
3. Statutory mandates and requirements;
4. Effective IS department.

#### **Inhibitors**

1. Not all sending agencies provide necessary and required data in accordance with statutory requirements in a timely or complete manner.
2. Other criminal justice agencies have limited access to OPII system and data;
3. Lack of access to other criminal justice agency's systems, applications, and data – particularly court case application systems, (e.g. JIS and Case.Net);
4. Challenging environment to build and maintain contemporary network;
5. Limited Internet and web access for MDOC;
6. Many routine documents and forms are not electronically transmitted. Many documents must be sent by certified mail per state statute.
7. Limited ability to enforce criminal justice personnel in other agencies to follow proper procedures.

#### **Critical Success Factors**

1. Timeliness, completeness, and accuracy of information.
2. Access to other criminal justice agencies data through integrated application systems.

There was agreement among MDOC study participants that the lack of electronic forms, documents, and data – readily available through an integrated system – particularly for routine operations, severely inhibit other criminal justice agencies' ability to provide required data in a timely, consistent, and complete manner. As a result, the vast majority of information exchanges are accomplished manually; often requiring multiple follow-up telephone calls and faxes to collect accurate and complete data. The participants felt that appropriate access to other justice



application systems by MDOC personnel would enable authorized access to data, and information would significantly improve the overall criminal justice system, while saving a substantial amount of time and money.

### **Appropriate and Hindering Constraints**

The following statutes were cited as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies.

#### **Chapter 43 RSMo State Highway Patrol**

##### **§43.503 RSMo Arrest, charge and disposition of misdemeanors and felonies to be sent to highway patrol.**

This section requires all police officers, the Clerk of each Court, MDOC, the Sheriff of each county, the chief Law Enforcement official of a city not within a county and the Prosecuting Attorney of each county or the circuit attorney of a city not within a county to submit certain criminal arrest, charge, and disposition information to the central repository for filing without undue delay in the form and manner required by sections §43.500 to 43.530.

#### **Chapter 217 RSMo Department of Corrections**

##### **§ 217.070 RSMo State Auditor to have access to all records, confidentiality.**

This section gives the state auditor access to all records maintained and established by MDOC.

##### **§ 217.075 RSMo Offender records, public records, exceptions--inspection of, when--access to medical records--copies admissible as evidence--violations, penalty.**

This section makes all records compiled, obtained, prepared or maintain MDOC or its divisions public records under § 610 RSMo with the following exceptions: (1) Any information, report, record or other document pertaining to an offender's personal medical history, which shall be a closed record; (2) Any information, report, record or other document in the control of the department or its divisions authorized by federal or state law to be a closed record; (3) Any internal administrative report or document relating to institutional security.

##### **§ 217.305 RSMo Delivery of prisoners to correctional centers with certain required information.**

This section states that (1) the Sheriff or other officer charged with the delivery of persons committed to MDOC shall deliver the person to the Reception and Diagnostic Center designated by the director at times and dates as designated by the director and shall receive a Certificate of Delivery of the offender from the center. It also specifies what information must accompany the prisoner.



**§ 217.450 RSMo Offender may request final disposition of pending indictment, information or complaint, how requested--director to notify offender of pending actions, failure to notify, effect.**

This section states that any person confined in a department correctional facility may request a final disposition of any untried Indictment, Information or Complaint pending in this state on the basis of which a detainer has been lodged against him while so imprisoned.

**§ 217.455 RSMo Director of division of adult institutions to transmit information and request.**

This section states that the director (1) certify the term of commitment under which the offender is being held, the time already served, the time remaining to be State Board of Probation and Parole relating to the offender; and (2) Send by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, one copy of the request and certificate to the court and one copy to the Prosecuting Attorney to whom it is addressed.

**Chapter 491 RSMo Witnesses**

**§491.230 RSMo Power to issue writ of habeas corpus--persons detained in correctional facility shall not attend civil proceeding--exceptions --conditions.**

This section states that Courts of record, and any judge or justice thereof, shall have power, upon the application of any party to a criminal suit or proceeding, pending in any Court of record, to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus for the purpose of bringing before such Court any person who may be detained in jail or prison within the state, for any cause, to be examined as a witness in such suit or proceeding, on behalf of the applicant.

**Chapter 532 RSMo Habeas Corpus**

This chapter outlines the procedures for Writs of Habeas Corpus and obtaining the body of a person in custody.

**Chapter 547 RSMo Appeals, New Trials and Exceptions**

This chapter governs the Appeal Status regarding bond release.

**Chapter 556 RSMo Preliminary Provisions (Criminal Code)**

**§ 556.061 RSMo Code definitions.**

**Chapter 558 RSMo Imprisonment.**

**§ 558.031 RSMo Calculation of terms of imprisonment--credit for jail time awaiting trial.**

This section defines the calculation of terms of imprisonment. It requires the officer required by law to deliver a person convicted of a crime to MDOC, and requires the officer to endorse upon the papers required by §217.305, RSMo, both the dates the offender was in custody and the period of time to be credited toward the service of the sentence of imprisonment, except as endorsed by such officer.



**§ 558.041 RSMo "Good time" credit, exceptions--rules, procedure.**

This section states that any offender committed to MDOC, except those persons committed pursuant to subsection 6 of §558.016 RSMo, or subsection 3 of section §558.018 RSMO, may receive additional credit in terms of days spent in confinement upon recommendation for such credit by the offender's institutional superintendent when the offender meets the requirements for such credit.

**§ 558.046 RSMo Reduction of term of sentence, conditions.**

This section states that the sentencing court may, upon petition, reduce any term of sentence or probation pronounced by the court or a term of conditional release or parole pronounced by the and Parole if the Court determines specific conditions.

The following policy cited as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies:

MDOC Policy and Procedure governs the proper updating of the face sheet as a result of a Legal Name Change Court Order.

**Stakeholder Recommendations**

MDOC Incarceration study participants made numerous recommendations to significantly improve the exchange of data among and between criminal justice agencies. The recommendations centered primarily on information needed, but not currently received, by MDOC. Recommendations are not attributed to the specific participant making the suggestion. Rather, the list is presented as a consolidated listing of recommendations. No attempt has been made to prioritize the recommendations.

**1. Sentencing Orders**

- a. It would be helpful if the Order for a change of venue included the county and prior cause number as a reference.
- b. If the cause number has changed for any reason, the prior referenced numbers should be noted and included.
- c. The Cause Number on the Order must be the Cause number under which the offender was sentenced.
- d. Require that the Judge's name be typed under the signature line on Orders that are signed by the Judge.
- e. It would be helpful for pertinent information to be included in instances where the Cause is to be served concurrent or consecutive with a federal, or out-of-state jurisdiction.
- f. Offense description must match the offense code description, i.e., Senate Bill #5, Dangerous Felon offenses pursuant to §556.061 RSMo.
- g. It would be very helpful for every county to have access to, and use, Case.Net for Court Docket/Court Minute information.

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



- h. It would be very helpful if the Writ Ad Testificandum denoted whether the writ is based on §491.230 RSMo and, if so, the section cited.
  - i. It would be very helpful if the Writ Ad Prosequendum contained the offense date and the offense description.
- 2. Jail Time Endorsements
  - a. Include all dates when the individual was held in custody – or held for the Sheriff by another agency.
  - b. Include the Cause Number under which the individual was being held.
  - c. Information should be sent to MDOC and not to the offender.
  - d. It would be very helpful for MDOC to know the reasons for release, if the offender is released from custody. The information should always include the class of offense, regardless of whether it's a felony, misdemeanor, or infraction.
- 3. Commitment Reports: Prosecutors should send documents and information at the time of commitment and it should be complete and accurate. It should also include a description of the offense, as well as the victim's age and gender.
- 4. Warrants
  - a. Add class of offense information to warrants.
  - b. Implement an electronic warrant system.
- 5. Writs: Add the offense date and offense information to all writs.
- 6. Dispositions
  - a. Submit complete disposition information for all misdemeanor and infractions cases from Municipal Courts. All systems and agencies must use the same standardized forms.
  - b. Implement an electronic link between the Circuit Courts and the MDOC Records Officer.
- 7. Information Requests: It takes considerable time and effort to locate requested information, as the process is manual. Create or improve MDOC's web site to include commonly requested, and appropriate to release, information.

### **Technology Assessment**

The technology available to the MDOC study participants is consistent and capable -- the current OPII system is the current agency computer system that processes justice information. OPII merges PAPIIS (Probation and Parole files) with OMIS (Department of Adult Institution) files. MDOC also has access to MULES.

There is limited office productivity software, such as word processors and spreadsheets. There is limited Internet access and e-mail capability.





None of the MDOC systems are integrated with Court Case Management systems, and none of the study participants have inquiry access to Court Case Management systems for Court information. The lack of integrated systems results in duplicate entry of information and information exchanges that are currently paper, fax, and phone call based. It is important to note that many of the MDOC exchanges must be sent via certified mailed, as directed by state statute.

There is virtually no electronic access to Law Enforcement, Prosecutor, Jails, and Courts' application systems, MULES being the sole exception. All information gathered from these sources is manual.

In addition to the extra workload associated with the manual exchange of information with external criminal justice agencies, significant effort is expended making phone calls and sending faxes to obtain required information.

Very limited technical services and software applications are supplied by outside providers, with the exception of MULES.

MDOC has technical staff to implement and support application systems.

### **Interagency Agreements**

MDOC Incarceration study participants identified the following interagency agreement regarding integration and information exchange:

- Memorandum of Understanding with MSHP for MULES access.

### **Existing Justice Information Systems**

MDOC identified the following Justice Information System currently being used:

- OPII - Inmate Management, Probation and Parole: Provides inmate management, probation and parole case management functions.

### **Mode Of Information Exchanges**

The mode (manual vs. automated) of MDOC Information Exchanges with external justice agencies is almost exclusively manual. Information sent and received from and between MDOC to Law Enforcement, Courts, County Jails, and P&P is communicated via paper or phone calls.

The only automated exchanges identified were responses received to inquiries into MULES.



### **Justice Agency Technical Environment and Technical Skills**

- Technical environment: There is limited office productivity software, such as word processors and spreadsheets. There is limited Internet access and e-mail capability.
- Technical skills: The MDOC study participants were from the Records Office and, as such, were not able to describe or comment on staff technical skills.

### **Outside Providers**

MDOC Incarceration study participants identified the following outside provider of software:

- Outside Provider: MSHP  
Product/Service: MULES access  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory



## **VI. Study Findings: MDOC - Probation and Parole**

### **Business Drivers**

MDOC P&P study participants identified the following Enablers, Inhibitors, and Critical Success Factors during the information gathering session:

#### **Enablers**

1. A computer system is used to store justice information.
2. Email access is available.
3. Computers are networked.
4. IT staff are employed.
5. There is an interface with MSHP for MULES access.
6. Some offices have Internet access.

#### **Inhibitors**

1. Access to the Internet is limited.
2. Outside email communications are limited.
3. Business practices are not consistent.
4. Business practices are not consistently followed.

#### **Critical Success Factors**

1. It is critical that application systems be integrated.
2. It is critical that all justice information be timely, complete, and accurate – from both a sending and receiving perspective.
3. Funding is critical.
4. Training is critical.
5. Business procedures need to be reviewed, revised, and enforced.
6. Existing state statutes need to be reviewed.

#### **Appropriate and Hindering Constraints**

MDOC P&P study participants cited the following state statutes as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies:



### **Chapter 43 RSMo State Highway Patrol**

#### **§ 43.506 RSMo – Crimes to be reported, exceptions--method of reporting--repository of latent prints.**

This section defines the crimes to be reported as all felonies and serious or aggravated misdemeanors consistent with the reporting standards established by the National Crime Information Center, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), for the Federal Interstate Identification Index System. In addition, all cases arising pursuant to sections §566.010 to 566.141, RSMo, where the defendant pleads guilty to an offense involving a child less than seventeen years of age and the court imposes a suspended imposition of sentence shall be reported.

This section also allows for electronic reporting and establishes a repository for latent prints.

### **Chapter 217 RSMo Department of Corrections**

#### **§ 217.362 RSMo Program for offenders with substance abuse addiction--eligibility, disposition, placement--completion, effect.**

This section directs MDOC to design and implement an intensive long-term program for the treatment of chronic nonviolent offenders with serious substance abuse addictions who have not pleaded guilty to or been convicted of a dangerous felony as defined in section §556.061 RSMo. It further specifies that prior to sentencing, any judge considering an offender for this program must notify MDOC.

NOTE: MDOC P&P study participants stated the §217.362 RSMo hinder information sharing. The Judges' interpretation of the indicates the offender should serve the sentence prescribed and void the right to be considered for probation of the sentence if the offender fails to complete the program, therefore, no amended Sentence and Judgment is necessary. However, the MDOC does not feel the statute addresses an inmate who is found to be ineligible for the program. They do not agree that a finding of ineligibility is the same as a failure to complete the program, and requires an amended order from the court. The MDOC feels the amended order is necessary for ineligible offenders because of their interpretation of the statute and has forwarded this issue to their legal counsel.

#### **§ 217.695 RSMo Release from custody under supervision of probation and parole, registration with law enforcement officials required.**

This section specifies that each offender to be released from MDOC who will be under the supervision of the Board, except an offender transferred to another state pursuant to the interstate corrections compact, shall shortly before release be required to: complete a registration form indicating his intended address upon release, employer, parent's address, and such other information as may be required; submit to photographs; submit to fingerprints; or undergo other identification procedures including but not limited to hair samples or other identification indicia. It further requires that MDOC, the Board, and the chief Law Enforcement official shall cause the information collected on the initial



registration and any subsequent changes in residence or registration to be recorded with MSHP.

### **Chapter 221 RSMo Jails and Jailers**

#### **§ 221.510 RSMo- Pending outstanding warrants in MULES and NCIC systems, inquiry conducted, when (Jakes Law)**

This requires law enforcement officials, jailers and MDOC to conduct checks for outstanding warrant in MULES and NCIC before an inmate is released from custody.

### **Chapter 549 RSMo Probation, Pardons and Paroles**

#### **§ 549.500 Documents of board to be privileged--exceptions--inspection.**

This section states that all documents prepared or obtained in the discharge of official duties by any member or employee of the board of probation and parole shall be privileged and shall not be disclosed directly or indirectly to anyone other than members of the board and other authorized employees of MDOC.

### **Chapter 559 RSMo Probation**

#### **§ 559.125 RSMo Record of applications for probation or parole to be kept --information to be privileged--exceptions.**

This section requires the Clerk of the Court to keep in a permanent file all applications for probation or parole, Pre-Sentence Investigations, probations or paroles granted, revoked or terminated, and all discharges from probations or paroles. It further states that information and data obtained by a P&P Officer shall be privileged information and shall not be receivable in any Court. Such information shall not be disclosed directly or indirectly to anyone other than the members of a parole board and the judge entitled to receive reports, except the court or the Board may in its discretion permit the inspection of the report, or parts of such report, by the defendant, or offender or his attorney, or other person having a proper interest therein.

### **Chapter 610 RSMo – Governmental Bodies and Records**

#### **§ 610.011 RSMO – Liberal construction of law to be public policy**

Generally referred to as the “Sunshine Law”, this section requires that meetings, records, votes, actions, and deliberations of public governmental bodies be open to the public unless otherwise provided by law.

MDOC P&P study participants cited the following internal policies as having an impact on information exchanges with external justice agencies:

Agency Policy P1-1.11 & P3-7 – Warrants

Agency Policy P1-1.5 – Records Checks

Agency Policy P7-1.10 – Photographs



Agency Policy P7-1.11 Confidentiality/Disclosure of Offender Records

Agency Policy P3-6.4 Supervision of Sex Offenders

Agency Policy P3-8-1 Violation Report General Procedures

## **Stakeholder Recommendations**

MDOC P&P study participants made a number of recommendations. The recommendations centered primarily on information needed, but not currently received, or not received in a timely manner. Recommendations are not attributed to the specific participant making the suggestion. Rather, the list is presented as a consolidated listing. No attempt has been made to prioritize the recommendations.

1. Provide the ability to access case information from the Court's online public information system, Case.Net.

Some P&P offices experience difficulty obtaining the required hard copy of defendants' case information from the Courts and Prosecutors. P&P protocol requires the file to be opened within two (2) days. Often this is delayed anywhere from seven (7) days to a month, as the necessary information is not received in a timely manner.

2. Courts need to provide the ability to view Court Cost information from Case.Net

This information is currently received manually in a majority of the jurisdictions. This information is received in the form of reports from the Courts, phone calls, or the P&P Officers going to the courthouse to obtain this information.

3. Provide access to MSHP hold files.

More complete arrest information is required by MDOC to assist in knowledgeable decisions regarding offender management.

4. Review business rules of the CHRS.

Criminal history information that is sent from MDOC to the CHRS is placed into a hold file unless all the information required earlier in the life cycle of the cases are received by MSHP. Life cycles consist of information from Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, and the Courts.

5. Automate communications through email.

MDOC has limited ability to communicate with Law Enforcement, Prosecutors, and Courts via email.



6. Allow Law Enforcement, Jails, Prosecutors, and Courts to inquire on information maintained in the Medic's OPII system, including Special Conditions of Probation and Parole.

This would increase the timeliness and efficiency of providing offender information to Law Enforcement, Jails, Prosecuting Attorneys and Courts.

7. Automate the Sex Offender Registration Notification and electronic communication of registration to MDOC.

This would increase timeliness of Sex Offender Registration Notification from the Sheriffs' Departments to MDOC.

8. Provide clarification for § 217.362 RSMo.

MDOC is not receiving amended Sentence and Judgment forms from Courts for offenders deemed ineligible for community sentencing programs.

9. Expedite the delivery of Offense Reports to MDOC institutions by obtaining an agreement with Law Enforcement to submit offense reports within 3 days of a request.

Obtaining official offense reports from Law Enforcement can take approximately 30 days. More timely receipt of this information would increase the efficiency of completing intake assessments and completion of violation reports for unauthorized returns.

10. Obtain an agreement with the Sheriffs to hold parolees in local jails a minimum of 5 days before returning them to MDOC.

This would reduce the number of unauthorized returns to MDOC.

11. Educate Law Enforcement on what when a "locate" is placed on a warrant.

There are inconsistencies in the way warrants are cleared in MULES. If Law Enforcement puts a locate on a warrant, the warrant is automatically cleared from the system within 72 hours, even if the offender is not taken into custody.

## **Technology Assessment**

The current OPII system is the current agency computer system that processes justice information. OPII merges PAPIS (P&P files) with OMIS (Department of Adult Institution) files.

P&P offices have access to MULES. There is limited Internet access and e-mail capability.

None of the P&P systems are integrated with Court Case Management systems, and none of the study participants have inquiry access to JIS for Court information. The lack of integrated systems result in duplicate entry of information and information exchanges that are currently paper, fax, and phone call based.

There is virtually no electronic access to Law Enforcement, Prosecutor, Jails, Courts and application systems; MULES being the sole exception. All information gathered from these sources is manual.

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax





In addition to the extra workload associated with the manual exchanges of information with external justice agencies, significant effort is expended making phone calls and sending faxes to obtain required information.

Very limited technical services and software applications are supplied by outside providers, with the exception of MULES.

P&P has technical staff to implement and support application systems.

There are plans for the MDOC to provide web access to public information and records.

The staff located inside of MDOC's institutions, for example the institutional parole officers, does not have access to the Internet or e-mail. This is due to building age and design constraints, as well as, financial constraints.

### **Interagency Agreements**

MDOC P&P study participants identified the following interagency agreements regarding integration and information exchanges:

- Memorandum of Understanding with MSHP for MULES access;
- The Attorney Generals Office has been given direct inquiry access to the MDOC's OPII system.

### **Existing Justice Information Systems**

MDOC P&P study participants identified the following Justice Information System as being used by them:

- OPII: Offender Management Information System

### **Mode Of Information Exchanges**

The mode (manual vs. automated) of MDOC P&P Information Exchanges with external agencies is predominately manual. Information sent from P&P to Law Enforcement, County Jails, Prosecutors, and Courts is communicated via paper, fax, or phone calls.

The only automated exchanges identified were inquiries into MULES and Case.Net.



### **Justice Agency Technical Skills**

MDOC P&P study participants identified their technical skills as follows:

- Technical skills: Programming: RPG  
System Administration: Windows NT/2000/XP and OS/400  
Database Administration: DB400

### **Outside Providers**

MDOC P&P study participants identified the following outside provider of software:

- Outside Provider: ACS Justice Information System  
Product/Service: Case Management System  
Capability to respond to needs: Satisfactory



## VII. JIEM Information Exchange Points

Information Exchanges – Law Enforcement									
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Data/Document Name
1	Action Taken form (on Writ)	Jail	Department of Corrections	Detention	Subject appeared in court on a Writ	Manual	Incarceration	Receive Information	Action Taken form
2	Application for 96 hour hold	Law Enforcement	Court	Investigation	Protective custody/observation requested	Manual	Pre-disposition court	Receive Information	Application for 96 hour hold
3	Request for Parole	Jail	Court	Detention	Inmate request	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Receive Information	Parole Request Form
4	Send Arrest history	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for info and/or case presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Arrest History Summary report
5	Arrest Report requested	Law Enforcement	Probation and Parole	Investigation	Probation and Parole wants information on subject under supervision who is arrested	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Arrest Report
6	Submit Arrest Reports	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Subject is arrested	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Arrest Report
7	Submit arresting officer information sheet	Law Enforcement	Jail	Investigation	Custody transfer	Manual	Detention	Receive Information	Arresting officer information sheet
8	Submit board bill	Jail	Department of Corrections	Detention	Person is transported from County Jail to Department of Corrections	Manual	Incarceration	Receive Information	Board bill
9	Submit bond envelope (with money)	Jail	Jail	Detention	Person in jail posts bond	Manual	Pre-Disposition Supervision	Receive Information	Bond envelope



Information Exchanges – Law Enforcement									
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Data/Document Name
10	Submit Bond Form	Jail	Jail	Detention	Subject posted bond	Manual	Pre-Disposition Supervision	Receive Information	Bond Form
11	Submit Information (case related)	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Information about a crime presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Case Information
12	Submit Certificate of Delivery of body to DOC	Jail	Court	Detention	Subject had been delivered to the Department of Corrections	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Receive Information	Certificate of Delivery
13	Submit jail time credits/transfer notification	Jail	Court	Detention	Transfer	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Receive Information	Certificate of Jail Time and Cost Incarceration
14	Forward sentence and judgment (certified copy) form	Jail	Department of Corrections	Detention	Person ordered by court to serve a sentence in the Department of Corrections	Manual	Incarceration	Receive Information	Certified copy of Sentence and Judgment
15	Send report of complaining party form	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Citizen Request for charges to be filed	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Complaining Party Report form
16	Send Signed Complaint by Officer	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Officer believes subject committed a crime	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Complaint Form (in lieu of affidavit)
17	Send Consent to Search forms	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Prosecutor needs copy of Consent to Search forms	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Consent to Search Form
18	Send completed court action form	Jail	Department of Corrections	Detention	Return on form	Manual	Incarceration	Receive Information	Court Action Form
19	Send criminal history	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Prosecutor needs criminal history	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Criminal History Summary Report
20	Send death in custody letter	Law Enforcement	MSHP/ records	Investigation	Subject is custody dies	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Death in Custody Form
21	Send Destruction of Evidence Request	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Case Disposed	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Destruction of Evidence Request Form



Information Exchanges – Law Enforcement									
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Data/Document Name
22	Send Destruction of property request	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Case Disposed	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Destruction of Property Request Form
23	Submit detainer request to state holding agency	Jail	Department of Corrections	Detention	Form letter forwarded to holding state prison /facility	Manual	Incarceration	Receive Information	Detainer request form letter
24	Submit DNA sample	Jail	MSHP/ records	Detention	Lab analysis is needed	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	DNA Sample Verification Form
25	Submit Evidence	Law Enforcement	MSHP/ records	Investigation	MSHP/ records	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Evidence
26	Forward Field Inquiry Report	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for info and/or case presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Field Inquiry Report
27	Forward Copies of fingerprint card	Law Enforcement	Law Enforcement	Investigation	Subject is arrested and arresting agency requests a copy of fingerprints	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Duplicate Copies Fingerprint Card - Arresting Agency Copies
28	Submit Fingerprint Card – FBI	Law Enforcement	MSHP/ records	Investigation	Subject booked	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Fingerprint Card - FBI
29	Submit Fingerprint Card - State	Law Enforcement	MSHP/ records	Investigation	Subject booked	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Fingerprint Card - State
30	Submit Fingerprint Card - Part 2 & 3 (blue and white carbons)	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Booking - Subject is fingerprinted and case submitted for prosecution	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Fingerprint Card Carbons (Part 2 & 3)
31	Send handwritten "FYI" forms	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Police Department has information prosecutor needs	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	FYI form
32	Submit Incident Reports	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for info and/or case presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Incident Report Form
33	Submit Information	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Case submitted for charges	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Information



Information Exchanges – Law Enforcement									
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Data/Document Name
34	Forward Inmate Medical Questionnaire	Law Enforcement	Jail	Investigation	Transfer	Manual	Detention	Receive Information	Inmate Medical Questionnaire
35	Send investigative report(s)	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Case submitted for charges	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Investigative Report
36	Request Investigative Subpoena	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Law Enforcement needs a subpoena	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Investigative Subpoena
37	Forward Medical notes/ inmate transfer notification	Jail	Jail	Detention	Transfer of custody	Manual	Detention	Receive Information	Jail doctor's memorandum on inmate health
38	Submit Jail List	Jail	Court	Detention	Routine procedure and/or request	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Jail List
39	Submit lab form/lab report	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Prosecutor needs lab reports	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Lab report
40	Submit Medical records	Jail	Prosecutor	Detention	Records request /Case is submitted for prosecution	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Medical records
41	Send medical history form	Jail	Department of Corrections	Detention	Subject is transferred from County Jail to Department of Corrections	Manual	Incarceration	Receive Information	Medical history form
42	Send notice	Jail	Court	Detention	Furlough failure to appear	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Receive Information	Memorandum of Notification
43	Send Miranda forms	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Prosecutor needs Miranda forms as part of an investigation	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Miranda Rights Form
44	Forward missing person report	Law Enforcement	MSHP - record	Investigation	Citizen's report	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	
45	Send MULES Validation Report	Law Enforcement	MSHP - record	Investigation	MSHP requires MULES Validation report	Manual	Record validation	Receive Information	MULES Validation Report



Information Exchanges – Law Enforcement									
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Data/Document Name
46	Submit Notice of Change of Court Date	Jail	Court	Detention	Incorrect court date was given on bond form	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Receive Information	Notice of Change of Court Date
47	Send Notices of County Arrest	Law Enforcement	Jail	Investigation	Local Law Enforcement made arrest on county warrant	Manual	Detention	Receive Information	Notices of County Arrest
48	Send Offense Report	Law Enforcement	Probation and Parole	Investigation	Request for report	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Offense Report Form
49	Send Offense Report	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for info and/or case presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Offense Report Form
50	Send photos	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for info and/or case presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Photo (s)
51	Make prisoner custody change	Jail	Jail	Detention	Transfer	Manual	Jail	Receive Information	Prisoner Receipt Form
52	Submit probable cause affidavit	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for info and/or case presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Probable Cause Affidavit
53	Submit Prosecutor's Case checklist	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Sheriff's department seeks warrant/charges	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Prosecutor Case Submission Form (checklist)/
54	Request Recoupment of funds	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Conviction for violation of 577.10 or 577.012	Manual	Post-Court disposition	Receive Information	Recoupment of Funds Request form
55	Request for Release of Evidence	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Case is disposed	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Receive Information	Release of Evidence Request Form
56	Request for Dispositions	Law Enforcement	Court	Investigation	Update request	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Receive Information	Request for case disposition information form Letter





Information Exchanges – Law Enforcement									
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Data/Document Name
57	Request for Destruction of Evidence	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Case is disposed	Manual	Pre-Disposition court	Receive Information	Request for Destruction of Evidence
58	Submit Lab request	Law Enforcement	MSHP - records	Investigation	Request by Sheriff's Department for laboratory analysis	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Request for lab analysis
59	Submit Returns on Warrants	Law Enforcement	Court	Investigation	Warrants served	Manual	Pre-Disposition court	Receive Information	Search Warrant Return Service
60	Request Search Warrant	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Law Enforcement needs a search warrant	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Search Warrant
61	Submit Return on Search Warrant	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Warrant served	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Search Warrant Return Service
62	Forward Sentence and Judgment form (with body)	Jail	Department of Corrections	Detention	Case Disposed through sentencing	Manual	Incarceration	Receive Information	Sentence and Judgment form
63	Submit Returns on Involuntary Commitments	Jail	Court	Detention	Subject was delivered for commitment	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Receive Information	Service Return receipt on Involuntary Commitments
64	Submit Sex Offender Change of Address Form	Law Enforcement	MSHP - records	Investigation	Convicted sex offender changes addresses	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Sex Offender Change of Address Form
65	Submit Sex Offender fingerprint card	Law Enforcement	MSHP/ records	Post-Supervision	Convicted sex offender moves into county	Manual	Post-Supervision	Receive Information	Sex Offender fingerprint card
66	Submit Sex Offender Registration Form	Law Enforcement	MSHP/ records	Post-Supervision	Convicted sex offender moves into county	Manual	Post-Supervision	Receive Information	Sex Offender Registration Form
67	Submit property information	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Investigation	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Supplemental property Report Form
68	Submit Supplemental Report	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Additional information is obtained/requested	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Supplemental Report Form



Information Exchanges – Law Enforcement									
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Data/Document Name
69	Submit inmate transfer documentation	Law Enforcement	Jail	Investigation	Subject transferred from arrest status to detention status	Manual	Detention	Receive Information	Transfer Form
70	Submit UCR Report	Law Enforcement	MSHP/ records	Investigation	Monthly report due date	Electronic	Investigation	Receive Information	UCR Report
71	Send victim statements	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for info and/or case presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Victim Statement Form
72	Submit victim/witness information form	Law Enforcement	Jail	Investigation	Probable cause arrest	Manual	Detention	Receive Information	Victim/witness notification information for jail (3 part carbon form)
73	Submit Voluntary Statements	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for info and/or case presented to prosecutor	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Voluntary Statement form
74	Submit Waiver of Extradition	Jail	Prosecutor	Detention	Inmate waives rights	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Waiver of Extradition
75	Submit Miranda statement/waiver	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Suspect waived rights	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Miranda/Waiver of Rights Form
76	Submit warrant returns	Law Enforcement	Court	Investigation	Warrants served	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Warrant Return notice (s)
77	Submit Warrant Request	Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Investigation	Officer believes subject committed a crime	Manual	Investigation	Receive Information	Warrant Request form
78	Submit work release request (supervised or unsupervised)	Jail	Court	Detention	Inmate request	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Receive Information	Work Release Application - Supervised
79	Submit Certified copy of Writs	Jail	Department of Corrections	Detention	Subject is incarcerated in the Department of Corrections	Manual	Incarceration	Receive Information	Writ



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
1	Follow-up Information Request	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Investigation	Additional Incident Information Needed	Manual	Investigation	Request for Additional Information		Follow-up Investigation Request
2	Notify Law Enforcement Court Date is Set	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Pre-disposition Court	Court Date is Set	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Schedule Court Appearance		Court Date Notification
3	Request Driving Record From Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Investigation	Court Date is Set and Driving Record Not Available	Manual	Investigation	Driving Record Requested		Department of Revenue Certified Copy Request (Driving Records)
4	Court Date Acknowledgement	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Court Date Received	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Court Date Set		Court Date Acknowledgement
5	Provide closing disposition report	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Post-disposition Court	Case Disposed	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Disposition Received		Case Disposition Report
6	Submit Destruction of Evidence Form	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Case Disposed	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Destruction of Evidence Request Received	If evidence is no longer needed	Destruction of Evidence
7	Submit Property Record	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Property Seized or Recovered	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Record of Case Related Property Received		Property Record



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
8	Report Restitution Status	Prosecutor	P & P	Post-Disposition Supervision	Restitution Status Report Needed	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Restitution Status Reported		Restitution Status Report
9	File Complaint	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Charging Decision	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Charges Filed	If defendant charged with felony in Associate Circuit Court	Complaint, Probable Cause Affidavit, Incident Report, Property Record
10	File Information	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Charging Decision	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Charges Filed	If defendant charged with felony in Circuit Court OR misdemeanor in Associate Circuit Court	Probable Cause Affidavit, Incident Report, Information, Summons, Disposition Statement, Property Record
11	Provide Copy of Filing Information to Law Enforcement	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Investigation	Charging Decision	Manual	Investigation	Filing Information Received		Information, Trial Setting Request.
12	Request Trial Setting	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Charging Decision	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Trial Date Requested		Trial setting request
13	Submit Case Number Request	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Charging Decision	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Case Number Request Received		Case Number Request



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
14	Submit Arrest Warrant Application	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Charging Decision and Defendant Not in Custody	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Arrest Warrant Application Received		Arrest Warrant Application, Arrest Warrant, Probable Cause Affidavit
15	Notification of Intent to Seek Death Penalty	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Decision to Seek Death Penalty	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty Received		Notice of Intent to Seek Death Penalty
16	Request Writ of Certiorari	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Desire US Supreme Court to Hear the Case	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Writ of Certiorari Requested		Writ of Certiorari Request
17	Provide Answer to Disclosure Request	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Disclosure Request Filed Requiring Prosecutor Response	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notice that Answer Provided to Defendant		Answer
18	File Discovery Motion	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Discovery Required	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Discovery Motion Filed		Discovery Request
19	File Indictment	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Grand Jury Issues Indictment	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Charges Filed		Indictment



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
20	Request Writ of Habeas Corpus	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Hearing or Trial Scheduled	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Writ of Habeas Corpus Requested		Writ of Habeas Corpus Application, Writ of Habeas Corpus
21	No True Bill	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Insufficient Evidence to Charge	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notification Received that Grand Jury Declined to Indict		No True Bill
22	Investigative Report	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Investigation	Investigative Report Completed	Manual	Investigation	Investigative Report Received		Investigative Report
23	Investigative Report	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Investigative Report Completed	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Investigative Report Received		Investigative Report
24	Submit Jury Instructions	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Jury Instructions Due	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Jury Instructions Received		Jury Instructions
25	Phone Call List Request	Prosecutor	Jail	Investigation	Need Defendant Phone Call List	Manual	Investigation	Defendant Phone Call List Requested		Phone Call List Request
26	File a Motion	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Need For Court Action	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Motion Filed		Motion
27	Request Pen Pack	Prosecutor	Jail	Investigation	Need Pen Pack Information	Manual	Incarceration	Pen Pack Requested		Pen Pack Request



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
28	Request Certification Status	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Need to Know Case Certification Status	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Case Certification Status Requested	If defendant requests jury trial	Trial Certification Status Request
29	Submit Retain Evidence Request	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Post-disposition Court	Need to Preserve Evidence	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Retain Evidence Request Received		Preserve Evidence Request
30	Send "Under Advisement" Form	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Investigation	Need to Provide Charging Status to Law Enforcement	Manual	Investigation	Charging Status Updated		Under Advisement Form
31	Request to Coordinate Prosecution	Prosecutor	Prosecutor	Investigation	Notification by Municipal Court that Municipal Law Enforcement filed in Circuit Court	Manual	Investigation	Request to Coordinate Prosecution Received		Coordinate Prosecution Request





Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
32	Request Extradition Prior to Adjudication	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Out of State Arrest of Defendant	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Extradition Request Received	If guilt has NOT been Adjudicated	Petition for Requisition Prior to Adjudication of Guilt, Authentication, Complaint or Information, Arrest Warrant, Copy of the Applicable Statute, and Fingerprints or Photo of Defendant.
33	Submit Search Warrant Application	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Probable Cause to Search	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Search Warrant Application Received		Search Warrant Application, Search Warrant Affidavit, Search Warrant
34	Submit Suggestion	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Prosecutor Chooses to Supply Legal Justification for Position	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Suggestion Received		Suggestion
35	Offense Disposition Chart Response	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Investigation	Prosecutor Response to Case Filed by Sheriff	Manual	Investigation	Prosecutor Disposition Status Received		Offense Disposition Chart



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
36	Entry of Appearance	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Prosecutor to Appear in Court	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notification Received that Prosecutor will Appear in Court		Entry of Appearance
37	Send "Refusal" Form	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Investigation	Refusal Decision	Manual	Investigation	Notification Received That Prosecutor Declines to Charge Defendant		Refusal Form
38	Submit Deposition	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Testimony Required	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Deposition Received		Deposition
39	Request Subpoena	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Trial or Hearing Set	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Subpoena Requested		Subpoena Request
40	Request Order for Body Attachment	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Witness Not Readily Available	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Order for Body Attachment Requested		Order for Body Attachment, Copy of Subpoena Served



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
41	Request Extradition After Guilt has been Adjudicated	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Out of State Arrest of Defendant	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Extradition Requested	If guilt has been Adjudicated	Petition for Requisition After Guilt has been Adjudicated, Authentication, Complaint or Information, Arrest Warrant, Copy of the Applicable Statute, and Fingerprints or Photo of Defendant.
42	Arraignment Request	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Charging Decision	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Arraignment Request Received		Arraignment Request
43	MULES Inquiry	Prosecutor	MSHP Records	Investigation	Defendant's Criminal Background Needed	Manual	Investigation	MULES Inquiry Received		MULES Inquiry
44	Report Restitution Status	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Restitution Status Report Needed	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Restitution Status Reported		Restitution Status Report
45	Sentencing Recommendations	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Defendant Found Guilty	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Sentencing Recommendations Received		Sentencing Recommendations



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
46	Submit Subpoenaed Records to Court	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Records Supplied in Response to Subpoena	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Subpoenaed Records Received		Subpoenaed Records, Affidavit for Business Records
47	Request Certified Copy of Defendant's Priors	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Prosecutor Needs Certified Copy of Defendant's Priors	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Certified Copy of Defendant's Priors Requested		Request for Certified Copy of Defendant's Priors
48	Photograph Return of Stolen Merchandise	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Photograph Return Received	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Photograph Return Received		Photograph Return
49	Request Warrant for Commitment to Await Requisition	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Desire Defendant be Detained While Awaiting Extradition to Another State	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Warrant for Commitment to Await Requisition Requested		Warrant for Commitment to Await Requisition



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
50	Cancel Writ of Habeas Corpus	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Prosecutor Desires to Cancel Writ of Habeas Corpus	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Request to Cancel Writ of Habeas Corpus Received		Memorandum Recalling Writ of Habeas Corpus
51	Notify Law Enforcement of Cancellation of Writ of Habeas Corpus	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Pre-disposition Court	Prosecutor Desires to Cancel Writ of Habeas Corpus	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notification Received That Writ of Habeas Corpus is Canceled		Memorandum Recalling State's Writ of Habeas Corpus
52	Waive Death Penalty	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Decision NOT to Seek Death Penalty	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notification That Prosecution Waives the Death Penalty Received	If death penalty previously sought	Notice of Intent not to Seek Death Penalty
53	Notification of Intent to Introduce Prior Convictions as Evidence	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Decision to Use Prior Convictions as Evidence	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notification of Intent to Introduce Prior Convictions as Evidence Received		Notice of Evidence in Aggravation and Supplemental Disclosure Pursuant to Section 565.005, RSMo.



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
54	Order for Disclosure	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Defendant Not Cooperating With Disclosure Request	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Request For Order Compelling Disclosure Received		Order for Disclosure
55	Request of Chief Justice of Missouri Supreme Court to Name County From Which Jurors may be Summoned and Selected for Trial	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Desire Jury Selection From Another County	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Request for Chief Justice to Name County For Jury Selection Received		Request of Chief Justice of Missouri Supreme Court to Name County From Which Jurors may be Summoned and Selected for Trial



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
56	Request That Out of State Witness Appear in Court to Testify	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Testimony of Out of State Witness Required	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Request That Out of State Witness Appear in Court to Testify Received		Certificate in Support of Request for Attendance of Out-of-state Witness, Certificate of Judge of Requesting State for Attendance of out-of-state Witness, Notice of Hearing and Order to Appear, Order Directing the Attendance of Witness in a Criminal Case in Another State, Check for Expenses
57	Notice of State's Intent to Rely on Lab Analysis	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	State Decision to Rely on Lab Analysis	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notification of State's Intent to Rely on Lab Analysis Received		Notice of State's Intent to Rely on Lab Analysis





Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
58	Notice of State's Intent to Introduce Business Records as Evidence	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Decision to Introduce Business Records as Evidence	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notification of State's Intent to Introduce Business Records as Evidence Received		Notice of Section 490.692 RSMo Service of Affidavit and Business Records
59	Submit Exhibit List for Trial	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Trial or Hearing Set	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Exhibit List Received		Exhibit List for Trial
60	Notice of State's Intention to Use Victim's Statement	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Decision to Use Victim's Statement	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Notification of State's Intention to Use Victim's Statement Received		Notice of State's Intention to use Victim's Statement Pursuant to Section 491.075, RSMo
61	Notice of Seizure	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Property Seized	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Notice of Seizure Received		Criminal Activity Forfeiture Act (CAFA) Notice of Seizure
62	Notification of Sale	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Post-disposition Court	Seized Property Sold	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Notification of Sale Received		Statement of Sale
63	Petition for Forfeiture	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Prosecutor Initiates Forfeiture Request	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Forfeiture Request Received		Petition for Forfeiture



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
64	Submit Restitution Agreement	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Restitution Agreement Reached	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Restitution Agreement Received		Restitution Agreement
65	Judgment and Destruction Order Request	Prosecutor	Court	Post-disposition Court	Decision to Destroy Property	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Judgment and Destruction Order Requested		Judgment and Destruction Order
66	Deliver Writ of Habeas Corpus	Prosecutor	Law Enforcement	Pre-disposition Court	Hearing or Trial Scheduled	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Writ of Habeas Corpus Received		Writ of Habeas Corpus
67	Send Victim Impact Statement	Prosecutor	P & P	Post-disposition Court	Pre-Sentence Investigation Begun	Manual	Post-disposition Court	Victim Impact Statement Received		Victim Impact Statement
68	Send Commitment Forms	Prosecutor	DOC	Post-disposition Supervision	Defendant Sentenced to Incarceration	Manual	Post-disposition Supervision	Commitment Forms Received		Commitment Form, Victim Contact Information
69	Amend Indictment	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Indictment Content Changed	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Amendments to Indictment Received		Indictment Amendment



Information Exchanges - Prosecutors										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
70	File Complaint and Information Summons	Prosecutor	Court	Investigation	Charging Decision	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Complaint and Information Summons Filed		Complaint and Information Summons, Subpoenas
71	Amend Complaint and Information Summons	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Decision to Modify Charges	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Amendments to Complaint and Information Summons Received		Complaint and Information Summons (Amended)
72	File a Continuance	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Decision to Delay Trial Start	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Continuance Filed		Continuance Request
73	Enter Stipulations	Prosecutor	Court	Pre-disposition Court	Stipulations Needed	Manual	Pre-disposition Court	Stipulations Received		Stipulation
74	Request Probation Violation Hearing	Prosecutor	P & P	Post-disposition Supervision	Prosecutor Discovers Failure to Comply with Probation Terms	Manual	Post-disposition Supervision	Probation Violation Hearing Requested		Probation Violation Hearing Request
75	Request Pen Pack	Prosecutor	DOC	Investigation	Need Pen Pack Information	Manual	Incarceration	Pen Pack Requested		Pen Pack Request



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
1	Sentence & Judgment: DOC	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	Intake	If case is disposed. OR If defendant incarcerated in another state.	CR 180 Sentence Judgment
2	Warrants for Detainer	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	Intake		Warrants for Detainer
3	Sentencing Orders	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	Intake	If orders affecting sentencing are issued.	Orders affecting Sentencing
4	Commitment to DOC	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	Intake		Commitment Papers
5	Constitutionality Petition	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Filing	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Petition filed in Circuit Court contains issues regarding constitutionality
6	Warrant Recall	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Recall	Manual / E-mail / Fax	Pre-Disposition Court	Update warrant information	If warrant is recalled	Recall of Warrant
7	Change of Venue	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Change of Venue or Supplemental Filing	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		CR50 Change of Venue Case Transfer



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
8	Change of Judge	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Change of Judge	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If Judge is changed.	Judge assignments
9	General Communications	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		General communications
10	Other county criminal warrants	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Issued	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Monitor criminal warrants in other counties
11	Judicial review of administrative hearing	Court	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposition	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Judicial review of administrative hearing
12	Case Scheduling	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	Court Event	Case(s) scheduled for events	Court Calendar
13	Subsequent Convictions	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	File Information Update	Subsequent convictions	CR185 Notice of Subsequent Convictions - Male CR186 Notice of Subsequent Convictions - Female
14	Court notes/docket	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	File Information Update	If defendant is returned to the DOC.	Court notes or docket.
15	Order Denying Probation	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	File Information Update	If probation denied.	Order Denying Probation



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
16	Reduction of Sentence Order	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Incarceration	File Information Update	If reduction of sentence is denied or granted.	Order Denying / Granting Reduction of Sentence
17	Writ	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Order	Manual	Incarceration	File Information Update	If defendant in Department of Corrections custody and ordered to appear	Writ
18	Amended Sentence & Judgment	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Sentence & Judgment	Manual	Incarceration	Intake	If sentence and judgment is amended AND Order of supervised probation issued	Amended Sentence and Judgment Order of Supervised Probation
19	Order for Fingerprint	Court	DOC	Post-Disposition Court	Status Report	Manual	Incarceration	Intake	If defendant not previously fingerprinted for same offense.	Order for Fingerprinting
20	Jail List over 90 or 120 days	Court	Jail	Detention	Incident	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If defendant in jail over 90 or 120 days.	Jail List Over 90 and 120 days
21	Arrest Information	Court	Jail	Detention	Arrest	Manual	Detention	Intake	If defendant is arrested by Court Marshall	Arrest Information



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
22	Sentence & Judgment to Jail	Court	Jail	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposed	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If case is disposed.	Sentence & Judgment
23	Electronic Monitoring List	Court	Jail	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Detention	File Information Update		Electronic Monitoring List
24	Court Calendar to Jail	Court	Jail	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Detention	File Information Update	If defendant is in custody. AND If hearing scheduled.	Court Calendar - Court Dates, Next Event, Bond Amount, Active Cases, Court Docket, Courtroom Assignment, Demographic Data
25	Court Calendar to Law Enforcement	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual		File Information Update	If hearing scheduled for case OR If case requires scheduling for officer appearances	Court Calendar
26	Confidential Case List	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Case Closed	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If case considered closed as documented in Chapter 610	Confidential Cases List



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
27	Disposition Information to MSHP Records	Court	MSHP Records	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposed	Manual, Electronic, Tape, Phone	Post-Disposition Court	Update criminal history record	If case is disposed OR If defendant is convicted OR If disposition is reported	Transmission of disposition information to MSHP.
28	Mental Exam Orders	Court	MSHP Records	Post-Disposition Court	Sentence & Judgment	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If Judgment or Order of Commitment to the Department of Mental Health is issued.	Mental Exam Order
29	Program Completion	Court	MSHP Records	Post-Disposition Court	Program Completion	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update criminal history record	If defendant completes alcohol or drug rehabilitation programs ordered by the court.	Completions of alcohol or drug rehabilitation programs ordered by the court. Update the record of convictions.
30	Closed Confidential Cases	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Case Closed	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Case Closed	If case is closed.	Closed Confidential Report
31	Sentence & Judgment	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposition	Manual, Electronic	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If municipal case disposed in Circuit Court.	Sentence & Judgment





Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
32	Remand Orders	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Case Remanded	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If case remanded.	Tickets, Remand Order
33	Mental Health Treatment Order	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Order	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If mental health treatment ordered.	Court Ordered Mental Health Treatment
34	Drug Treatment Order	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Order	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If drug treatment ordered.	Court Ordered Drug Treatment
35	Orders of Probation	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Order	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If probation ordered.	Orders of Probation
36	Remand Set Aside	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Remand set aside	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If case remand is set aside.	Remand set aside.
37	Restitution Order	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Restitution Ordered	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If restitution is ordered.	Restitution Order with Victim Information
38	Checks	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Turn over funds to Court	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If checks for fines are received.	Checks
39	Custody	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Defendant in custody	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If defendant taken into custody	Custody
40	Warrants	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Issued	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If warrant issued	Warrants



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
41	Pending Court Dates	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Status Report	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Status Review		Pending Court Dates
42	Issue Probation Warrant	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Warrant Issues	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Arrest	If warrant issued	CR240 Warrant for Arrest
43	Probation Revocation	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Revocation hearing	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Case Closed	If probation revoked	CR147 Probation Revocation
44	Pre-Sentence Investigation Order	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Acceptance of plea or finding of guilt	Manual	Investigation	Complete Pre-Sentence Investigation	If Pre-Sentence Investigation ordered by the Court	Pretrial Order - Request for investigation report
45	Sentence & Judgment: P&P	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposition	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If case disposed.	Sentence & Judgment
46	Notice of Court Action	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update	If court action.	Notification of court action.
47	Order Amending Conditions of Probation	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update	If probation conditions amended	Order Amending Conditions of Probation
48	Order Setting Bond on P&P Warrant	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update	If bond is set on P & P warrant.	Order Setting Bond on Probation and Parole Warrant



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
49	Sentence Reduction Order	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update	If reduction of sentence denied or granted.	Order Denying/Granting Reduction of Sentence.
50	Court Costs / Fines / Restitution Report	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Status Report	Manual, Electronic, Phone	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update	If court costs/fines/restitution exist.	Court Costs/Fines/Restitution Report
51	Probation Revocation Summons	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Summons request	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update	If summons issued.	Summons and Order to Appear (Probation Revocation or Modification)
52	Violation Reports	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update		Violation Reports
53	Order of Probation	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Intake	If probation ordered.	CR144 Order of Probation CR144A Order of Probation (Supervised) DOC form CR250 Order of Supervised Probation
54	120 P & P Shock Order	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Intake	If 120 day P & P Shock Order issued.	CR181 Order (559.115 Review)
55	Program Availability	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Notify Court of Program availability		Requests for program availability.



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
56	Request to Revoke Probation	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Status Report	If hearing to revoke probation is scheduled.	Motion or request to revoke probation.
57	Arrest Information	Court	Law Enforcement	Detention	Arrest	Manual	Detention	Intake	If defendant is arrested by Court Marshall.	Arrest information
58	Sentence & Judgment	Court	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposition	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If case is disposed OR If defendant is convicted OR If evidence is involved in	Sentence & Judgment
59	Electronic Monitoring List	Court	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Electronic Monitoring List
60	Orders of Expungement	Court	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If motion granted by the court.	CR143 Judgment Order - Expungement Arrest Record



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
61	Warrants	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Issued	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Served	If warrant issued by the Court OR If warrant issued for revoked probation	Warrant
62	Arrest Information	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Arrest	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If defendant is arrested by Court Marshall.	Arrest information
63	Order for Show Cause	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Court Event	If motion filed for Forensic DNA Testing.	Order to Show Cause for Post Conviction Forensic DNA Testing Not Available at Trial
64	Sentence & Judgment	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposition	Manual, Electronic	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If case is disposed OR If order of commitment entered	Sentence & Judgment
65	Order Denying Probation	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If probation denied.	Order Denying Probation



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
66	Probation Modification Order	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If probation modification ordered.	Probation Modification Order
67	Order Setting Bond on P&P Warrant	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If bond is set on P&P warrant.	Order Setting Bond on Probation and Parole Warrant
68	Probation Revocation	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Initial Appearance and Order Setting Motion to Revoke Probation for Hearing
69	Probation Revocation Orders	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Orders after Initial Appearance on Motion to Revoke Probation
70	Court Calendar	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual, Electronic	Pre-Disposition Court	Update Schedule	If hearing scheduled for case OR If Municipal Prosecutor inquires on scheduling using Court's system.	Court Calendar



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
71	Electronic Monitoring List	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Incarceration	File Information Update		Electronic Monitoring List
72	Sentence Reduction Order	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If reduction of sentence denied or granted.	Order Denying/Granting Reduction of Sentence
73	Probation Revocation Summons	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Summons Issued	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If summons issued.	Summons and Order to Appear (Probation Revocation or Modification)
74	Annual Statistics	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Monthly statistics	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Monthly Statistics		Annual report data/statistics
75	Probation Order	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update	If probation ordered OR If notice of intent to grant probation is filed	Probation agreement/order (559.115)
76	Waiver of Extradition	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Extradition	If request for extradition filed.	Waiver of Extradition and Consent to Return
77	Arraignment	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Arraignment and Pretrial Orders



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
78	Initial Appearance	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If initial appearance proceedings occur.	Initial Appearance Proceedings
79	Notice of Hearing	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If Prosecuting Attorney enters and appearance.	Notice of Hearing
80	Bond	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If bond is set.	Bond Form
81	Bond Forfeiture	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If bond is forfeited.	CR130 Notice of Bond Forfeiture Judgment
82	Wiretap Order	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Investigation	File Information Update	If request for wiretap.	CR150 Report Communications Interception - Application for, issuance or extension of any wiretap order
83	Filings	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Filings
84	Pending Cases	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Pending cases





Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
85	Trial/Mediation Order	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If trial setting / mediation ordered.	Trial Setting Order / Trial Setting and Mediation Order
86	Trial Scheduling Order	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If trial scheduling ordered.	Trial Scheduling Order
87	Warrant Recall	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant recall	Manual, Electronic, Fax	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If warrant is recalled.	Recall of Warrant
88	Docket Sheet and Calendar	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Daily Reports	Electronic	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Clerks docket sheet, Clerks calendar, Pending service report
89	Order of Joinder	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Joinder	If order of joinder issued.	Order of Joinder
90	Bond Recommendation	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Bond recommendation	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Review bond recommendation	If court makes a bond recommendation.	Recommendation on Bond Investigation
91	Order of Severance	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Severance	If order of severance issued.	Order of Severance
92	Test Results	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Status Report	If motion to test for sexually transmitted diseases filed.	Test results



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
93	Warrant	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant served	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant served	If warrant is returned.	Warrant
94	Summons	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Summons Issued	Manual	Investigation	Summons served	If summons issued.	Summons
95	Order Setting Bond on P&P Warrant	Court	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	File Information Update	If bond is set on P&P warrant.	Order Setting Bond on Probation and Parole Warrant
96	Commitment to Jail	Court	Jail	Post-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Detention	Intake	If order issued.	Commitment Orders
97	Probation Revocation Summons	Court	Sheriff	Post-Disposition Court	Summons Issued	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Summons Served	If summons issued.	Summons and Order to Appear (Probation Revocation or Modification)
98	Bond	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If bond is issued.	Bond Form
99	Show Cause Order	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Summons Issued	Manual	Investigation	Summons Served	If Show Cause is ordered.	Show Cause Order
100	Subpoena Order	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Subpoena Issued	Manual	Investigation	Subpoena Served	If subpoena ordered.	Subpoena Order



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
101	Writ	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Detention	Transport Defendant to Court	If Court requests defendant transportation.	Writs for prisoner's transportation
102	Warrant Served	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Arrest	Manual	Detention	Warrant Served		Warrant Return of Service
103	Search Warrant	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Issued	Manual	Investigation	Warrant Served	If search warrant issued.	Search Warrant
104	Offender Status	Court	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposition	Phone	Pre-Disposition Court	Information request	If Court inquires on status of offender.	Court inquires with jail regarding the status of the offender.
105	Certification of Violations	Court	Court	Investigation	Charge Filing	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Certification of Violations
106	Notice of Appeal	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Case Appealed	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If Municipal Court disposition is appealed.	CR120 Notice of Appeal
107	Tickets	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Case Appealed	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If ticket issued.	Tickets
108	Community Service List	Court	Court	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Active Community Service List



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
109	Bond Delinquency	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Notice of Delinquent Bond Judgments / Bonding Companies	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If bond is delinquent or bond company is delinquent.	Delinquent Bond Judgment / Bonding Companies
110	Request for Jury Trial	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Jury Trial Request	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If Jury Trial requested.	Request for Jury Trial
111	Caseload Report	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Monthly statistics	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Monthly statistics		Case load report
112	Bond Schedule	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Update schedule	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Update schedule		Bond Schedule
113	Warrant	Court	DOC	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Issued	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If defendant incarcerated in the DOC and a case is pending in Municipal Court.	Warrant - Warrant issued and sent to the Department of Corrections if the defendant refuses to sign a Plea of Guilty/Waiver of Counsel form.
114	Amended Judgment	Court	Jail	Post-Disposition Court	Amended Judgment	Manual	Detention	File Information Update	If Judgment is amended.	Amended Judgment Form
115	Appeals Docket	Court	Jail	Post-Disposition Court	Status Report	Manual	Detention	Status Review		Municipal Correctional Institute appeals docket

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
116	Medical Evaluation / Substance Abuse Order	Court	Jail	Pre-Disposition Court	Order	Manual	Detention	File Information Update	If medical evaluation / substance abuse ordered.	Order for Medical Evaluation / Substance Abuse
117	Order for Release	Court	Jail	Pre-Disposition Court	Release ordered	Manual	Detention	Release detainee		Order for Release
118	Bond	Court	Court	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Served	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If defendant arrested on a warrant from another jurisdiction.	Bond Form
119	Return of Plea Offer / Agreement by Court	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Court Event	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If the Court does not accept the plea bargain recommended by the Prosecutor.	Plea Offer/Agreement
120	Request for Certified Case Files	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Information Request	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update		Certified copies of case files
121	Criminal History	Court	P&P	Post-Disposition Court	Information Request	Fax	Post-Disposition Court	Investigation	If State P&P office requests information regarding pending and disposed case information.	Criminal History Information



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
122	Summons & active Warrants	Court	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Court	Information Request	Electronic	Investigation	Incident	If Law Enforcement seeks additional information.	Summons and active Warrant information
123	Statistics	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Information Request	Fax	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If statistical requests from city police department.	Statistical Reports
124	Medical Evaluation / Substance Abuse Order	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Order	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If order for medical evaluation / substance abuse issued.	Order for Medical Evaluation / Substance Abuse
125	Pick Up Order	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Arrest	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Transport Defendant to Court	If defendant in custody in the County Jail.	Pick Up Order - Order requesting defendant be transported from the county jail to the municipal court.
126	Ticket Book	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Issue Ticket Books	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Update Administration records	If ticket book issued.	Ticket Book



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
127	No Original Warrant Received	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Recall	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Warrant Returned	If original copy of warrant has not been returned by Law Enforcement.	No Original Warrant Received
128	Disposition Information	Court	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Court	Case Disposition	Electronic	Post-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If law enforcement seeks additional information.	Summons and Disposition Information
129	Warrant Activity List	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Information Request	Manual	Pre-Disposition	File Information Update	If information requested by City Police Department.	Warrant Activity List - Statistics of warrants recalled, served and issued.
130	Disposition Information	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Information Request	Manual, Electronic	Investigation	File Information Update	If the case is disposed and the County Prosecuting Attorney requests copy OR If Municipal Prosecutor requests information to determine plea bargain	Information, Plea of Guilty Waiver and Waiver of Counsel

Tier Technologies, Inc. 1002 Diamond Ridge; Suite 1200 Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 635-9979 – office (573) 635-9982 – fax



Information Exchanges - Courts										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
131	Nolle Prosequi Cases needing signature	Court	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Send Nolle Prosequi cases to Court	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Sign Nolle Prosequi cases		Report of Batch Nolle Prosequi cases for signature.
132	Tickets	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Ticket Issued	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If ticket issued.	Tickets
133	Ticket Request	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Request Ticket	Oral, Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	Send ticket to Court	If ticket is requested.	Ticket Request
134	Affidavit	Court	Prosecutor	Pre-Disposition Court	Affidavit received	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If someone mails in an Affidavit.	Affidavit
135	Sentence & Judgment	Court	Law Enforcement	Pre-Disposition Court	Arraignment	Manual	Pre-Disposition Court	File Information Update	If defendant in custody and video arraignment is held on the case.	Sentence & Judgment, Trial Dates, Bonds, or Commitment to Hold





Information Exchanges – Missouri Department of Corrections - Incarceration										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
1	Confirmation of Delivery of an Offender	MDOC	Law Enforcement	Incarceration	Law Enforcement delivers body for incarceration	Manual	Incarceration	Inmate delivered	If inmate delivered	Confirmation of Delivery Form
2	Request Clarification on Court Documentation	MDOC	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Court documentation unclear	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Request	If Court documentation unclear	Request for clarification
3	Respond to Request for Pen Pack	MDOC	Prosecutor	Investigation	Request for Pen Pack	Manual	Investigation	Information received	If request received	Pen Pack
4	Send Copy of Offender Registration Form	MDOC	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Supervision	Inmate has release date	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Receive Offender Registration Form	If charge is a sex offense	Offender Registration Form
7	Send Fingerprints	MDOC	MSHP/Records	Incarceration	Intake	Electronic	Post-Disposition Court	Receive Fingerprints	If inmate enters MDOC	Fingerprint Card - Inmate
8	Send Information on Crime Committed while in MDOC	MDOC	Prosecutor	Investigation	Charges sought	Manual	Investigation	Receive information on crime	Inmate is alleged to have committed a crime in MDOC	Investigative Report
9	Send Inmate Case file information	MDOC	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Request for case information	Manual	Investigation	Receive information	If request received	Sentence and Judgment Form, Face Sheet, other documents
10	Send Legal Name Change Notification	MDOC	Court	Post-Disposition Court	Inmate is granted legal name change	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Receive notice of name change	If legal name change was granted	Notification of legal name change
11	Send Legal Name Change Notification	MDOC	Prosecutor	Post-Disposition Court	Inmate is granted legal name change	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Receive notice of name change	If legal name change was granted	Notification of legal name change
12	Send Letter of Incarceration	MDOC	Law Enforcement	Incarceration	Request for confirmation of incarceration	Manual	Investigation	Receive information	If request received	Letter confirming incarceration



### Information Exchanges – Missouri Department of Corrections - Incarceration

Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
13	Send Warrant Release Notification	MDOC	Court	Post-Disposition Supervision	Inmate has release date	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Receive information	Inmate has a release date	Warrant Release Notification
14	Send Warrant Release Notification	MDOC	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Supervision	Inmate has release date	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Receive information	Inmate has a release date	Warrant Release Notification
15	Verify Inmate Identification	MDOC	Court	Investigation	Request for identification	Manual	Investigation	Receive information	If request received	Verification of inmate identity

### Information Exchanges – Missouri Department of Corrections – P&P

Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
1	10 min hit confirmation	P & P	MSHP Records	Post-Disposition Supervision	Arrest	Electronic	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If offender arrested on outstanding Parole Warrant	10 Minute Hit Confirmation
2	Movement IOC	P & P	MSHP Records	Post-Disposition Supervision	Arrest	Electronic	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If offender arrested on State Probation and Parole Warrant.	Movement IOC
3	Clear Warrant	P & P	MSHP Records	Post-Disposition Supervision	Arrest	Electronic	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	Offender arrested or locate placed by Law Enforcement	Clear Warrant Notification



Information Exchanges – Missouri Department of Corrections – P&P										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
4	Missouri Offender Registration Change of Address	P & P	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Supervision	Change County of Residence	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If offender changes county of residence as described in Statute 589.414 RSMo.	Missouri Offender Registration Change of Address
5	Letter of Ineligibility	P & P	Court	Incarceration	Intake	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If offender is found ineligible for MDOC	Letter of Ineligibility
6	Letter of Ineligibility	P & P	Prosecuting Attorney	Incarceration	Intake	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If offender is found ineligible for MDOC program	Letter of Ineligibility
7	Missouri Offender Registration Notification	P & P	Law Enforcement	Post-Disposition Supervision	Intake	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If offender required to register per Statute 589.400.	Missouri Offender Registration Notification
8	State Probation and Parole Warrant	P & P	Jail	Post-Disposition Supervision	Parole Violation	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If parole warrant necessary to bring in or hold offender in jail	State Probation and Parole Warrant
9	State Probation and Parole Warrant	P & P	MSHP Records	Post-Disposition Supervision	Parole Violation	Electronic	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If parole warrant necessary to bring in or hold offender in jail	State Probation and Parole Warrant
10	Pre-Sentence Investigation	P & P	Court	Post-Disposition Court	PSI Completion	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Sentence Hearing		PSI Report



Information Exchanges – Missouri Department of Corrections – P&P										
Exchange Number	Exchange Name	Sending Agency	Receiving Agency	Sending Agency Process	Sending Agency Triggering Event	Exchange Mode	Receiving Agency Process	Receiving Agency Event	Condition	Data/Document Name
11	Pres-Sentence Investigation	P & P	Prosecuting Attorney	Post-Disposition Court	PSI Completion	Manual	Post-Disposition Court	Update File		PSI Report
12	DNA Testing Date	P & P	MSHP Records	Post-Disposition Supervision	Request	Electronic	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If request for DNA testing sent by MSHP	DNA Testing Date
13	Case Summary Report	P & P	Court	Post-Disposition Supervision	Status Report	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	Completed every 6 months while defendant on probation supervision	Case Summary Report
14	Case Summary Report	P & P	Prosecuting Attorney	Post-Disposition Supervision	Status Report	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	Completed every 6 months while defendant on probation supervision	Case Summary Report
15	Violation Report	P & P	Court	Post-Disposition Supervision	Status Report	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If defendant violates conditions of probation	Violation Report
16	Violation Report	P & P	Prosecuting Attorney	Post-Disposition Supervision	Status Report	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If defendant violates conditions of probation	Violation Report
17	Warrant Cancellation	P & P	Jail	Post-Disposition Supervision	Warrant Canceled	Manual	Post-Disposition Supervision	Update File	If warrant canceled	Warrant Cancellation